

LPLT Admission Consultation Full Report - Children of Primary School Staff

Notes on redactions:

1. Personal data categories have been removed.
2. Personal data within all other response categories has been redacted and will appear as a white gap in the text.
3. Some redactions have been made due to the provision of the Education (Independent School Standards) Regulations 2014 (ISS Regulations). Where this is the case, the text has been removed and replaced with [Deleted due to the requirements of the ISS Regulations].

Form Submission ID		Children of Staff (Primary Schools)	
OVERSUBSCRIPTION CRITERIA - Children of staff (Primary Schools) What is your view of the proposal to give priority to the children of staff employed at the primary schools in the school's admission arrangements		If you would like to give your reasons, comment on the proposed change, or make any suggestions, please do so below (if your comments relate to a specific school, please make this clear by stating the school's name):	
Agree	733		
Disagree	1464		
Neutral	752		
Not Applicable	93		
No Response	33		
1	Disagree		
2	Neutral		
3	Agree		It makes sense for a teacher who is already travelling to the location to have priority in their child's admission.
4	Neutral		
5	Agree		
6	Disagree		
7	Agree		
8	Disagree		
9	Neutral		
10	Disagree		
11	Neutral		
12	Agree		
13	Neutral		
14	Agree		
15	Neutral		
16	Agree		
17	Agree		
18	Disagree		
19	Agree		
20	Disagree		
21	Neutral		
22	Agree		
23	Agree		
24	Agree		

25	Agree		
26	Disagree		
27	Disagree		
28	Disagree		Children need to go to a school in their local community for basic safety as the area is less safe and they shouldn't be further from home than necessary. Children from Trust schools staff should not take places of children who live in the catchment.
29	Neutral		
30	Disagree		These schools have small amount of spaces as it is and it is essential to give opportunity for children living close by to be able to be accepted equally.
31	Neutral		
32	Disagree		
33	Agree		
34	Agree		
35	Agree		
36	Neutral		
37	Disagree		
38	Disagree		
39	Neutral		
40	Neutral		
41	Neutral		
42	Disagree		They have no need of this facility. It does not service the community or benefit teachers or children. It is simply a recruitment tool for those primary schools. I am amazed that it is even a consideration as the parents do not work at LP secondary schools so it does not even serve their daily commute needs!
43	Neutral		
44	Disagree		
45	Agree		
46	Disagree		Not fair doesn't serve the entire local community
47	Agree		
48	Neutral		
49	Agree		
50	Neutral		
51	Agree		
52	Disagree		
53	Disagree		
54	Disagree		
55	Disagree		I don't think they should be given priority but certainly consideration should be made as this may prevent the teacher from working at the school for the required hours
56	Agree		
57	Disagree		
58	Disagree		I have never felt it important that children are attending the same school that parents work in, in fact it can unhelpful for the child.
59	Disagree		
60	Disagree		
61	Agree		
62	Agree		I think this represents a lovely employment benefit for an individual.
63	Disagree		
64	Neutral		
65	Disagree		the catchment is tough enough and already people who are able spend excessive amounts on housing to be close to the school. this would exacerbate the issue.
66	Neutral		
67	Agree		
68	Disagree		
69	Neutral		
70	Neutral		I believe it will have minimal impact due to the few people this will apply to.
71	Neutral		
72	Agree		

73	Disagree		What happens if a non-local teacher joins the school simply to get their child in, and then subsequently leaves the post? A local child may have been deprived of a place? Or the teacher leaves the post for a genuine reason, does their child keep the place?
74	Agree		
75	Disagree		
76	Disagree		
77	Disagree		
78	Neutral		
79	Agree		
80	Agree		
81	Disagree		
82	Disagree		
83	Disagree		
84	Neutral		
85	Disagree		
86	Neutral		
87	Neutral		
88	Neutral		
89	Neutral		
90	Disagree		Staff at the individual primary school could be given priority to retain staff, but I do not feel it is justifiable over the group of schools. If they are a teacher at a primary it should have no bearing on the secondary school place status for their child.
91	Neutral		
92	Agree		
93	Agree		
94	Neutral		
95	Agree		
96	Agree		
97	Neutral		
98	Disagree		
99	Neutral		
100	Agree		
101	Agree		
102	Disagree		Why should their children get priority over mine?
103	Disagree		
104	Disagree		<p>I feel this is grossly unfair on children who live within current catchment areas for the secondary schools but do not attend a primary within the MAT (Unicorn, Pickhurst, Oak Lodge, Highfield etc). If children enter the MAT at 4 m, the family then could move anywhere and keep any siblings in the Langley schools to 18 of home location. This is unfair on local families, the students having to travel a longer distance to school - with the increased traffic and pollution in Hawksbrook Lane which I understood to be a priority for the schools? Secondary students, should in most circumstances, be able to travel independently but this may impact this and the traffic situation would worsen.</p> <p>It may also have an impact on primary schools not in the MAT as they may be seen as less viable options due to not being feeder schools.</p> <p>The competition for Langley secondary places is huge as I know to my cost (), I think this adds an unfair criteria to the schools to the detriment of the local community.</p>
105	Not Applicable		
106	Neutral		
107	Neutral		
108	Neutral		
109	Disagree		
110	Disagree		
111	Disagree		
112	Disagree		

113	Disagree		
114	Disagree		Schools exist to serve the local community, not people who live far away. Priority should be given to children based on proximity. No child should be forced to travel a long distance to go to school
115	Disagree		
116	Neutral		
117	Agree		
118	Neutral		
119	Agree		
120	Agree		
121	Neutral		
122	Neutral		
123	Disagree		How is it equitable to prioritise the children of teachers over other professions eg nurses?
124	Neutral		
125	Agree		
126	Agree		
127	Disagree		
128	Neutral		
129	Disagree		
130	Disagree		
131	Disagree		
132	Disagree		
133	Neutral		
134	Disagree		
135	Disagree		
136	Disagree		
137	Disagree		
138	Agree		
139	Disagree		
140	Agree		
141	Agree		
142	Disagree		
143	Disagree		Education options should be owned by the community. The proposal seems to go against equality.
144	Agree		
145	Disagree		
146	Disagree		I feel that all full time working parents have the issue of childcare and it is unfair that local children might be sent further to go to school so that a child (who may not even be travelling with their parent who is a member of staff) can have their place.
147	Disagree		In any other type of business/industry, your work location does not then determine where your child can attend school. Staff in education should not be given an advantage, potentially taking places of children who live locally, and forcing them to have to travel further to attend school.
148	Neutral		
149	Disagree		
150	Agree		
151	Disagree		
152	Disagree		
153	Agree		
154	Agree		
155	Disagree		
156	Agree		
157	No Response		
158	Disagree		
159	Disagree		

160	Disagree		
161	Disagree		
162	Disagree		I don't agree with feeder schools and local children being treated differently to other children
163	Disagree		We had to buy in the catchment to get a place . This could knock out those of us that pay dearly to live in the catchment.
164	Disagree		Priority should be only considered for the respective school staff I.e primary schools offer priority to children of primary school staff and secondary school offers priority to children of secondary school staff.
165	Disagree		
166	Disagree		
167	Agree		
168	Agree		A good family friendly arrangement
169	Agree		
170	Neutral		
171	Disagree		
172	Disagree		Unfair
173	Agree		Agree with the retention of staff point. Teachers work very hard and would like to see options like this for them. It would be nice to have their own child on site where they can more easily attend events or parents evenings etc.
174	Disagree		
175	Agree		
176	Disagree		
177	Disagree		
178	Disagree		The current oversubscription criteria are adequate. There are many teachers in the feeder schools and this proposal would command too high a proportion of places at the exclusion of families who live near to the school.
179	Disagree		Under Equality Act of 2010, all applicants compliant with school's admission requirements should be treated equally.
180	Disagree		
181	Agree		
182	Agree		As a myself, I understand how much teachers give up for their own families e.g attend their own kids concerts/ plays/ sports day/open classroom. It's only reasonable for the teachers to have the same opportunities to share these moments with their kids if in the same school
183	Agree		
184	Disagree		
185	Disagree		
186	Agree		
187	Neutral		
188	Agree		
189	Agree		
190	Disagree		
191	Agree		
192	Neutral		
193	Agree		
194	Neutral		
195	Agree		
196	Neutral		
197	Neutral		However after reading the consultation documents if the proposal is going to bring in quality teachers then this is a good thing. _x000D_ Only one concern that i might have this place allocation for the children of the teachers child / children should not hinder a local child from been accepted at either PL boys / Girls. Extra precaution should be made that all admission are fair.
198	Disagree		
199	Disagree		
200	Agree		
201	Agree		
202	Not Applicable		
203	Neutral		

204	Neutral		
205	Disagree		
206	Neutral		
207	Disagree		
208	Disagree		
209	Agree		
210	Disagree		To be truly inclusive admissions must not favour teachers children
211	Neutral		
212	Disagree		
213	Disagree		There is no rationale for offering this priority. Staff retention is up to the individual primary schools to achieve.
214	Neutral		
215	Disagree		
216	Agree		
217	Disagree		
218	Disagree		
219	Agree		We need to have more available schools for our children and this will incentivise the schools to increase their performance and let the best schools prosper. I do not mind introducing competition between the schools and having result tables comparing all schools (private and public) on the results achieved.
220	Disagree		
221	Not Applicable		
222	Agree		
223	Disagree		
224	Disagree		Schools in the Beckenham area are already oversubscribed with pupils potentially being faced with the prospect of either having to travel across the borough or outside of the borough. If staff live within the community and would normally meet the 'all other children' criteria then I have no issue with them being given preference however if they live outside of the admissions area then they should not be given preference over a child that then has an excessive commute or has to travel outside of the borough. This is a particular concern given the levels of gang violence in and around the London and Greater London areas with the possibility of excessive commutes potentially leaving them vulnerable.
225	Agree		
226	Disagree		
227	Disagree		
228	Neutral		
229	Disagree		
230	Disagree		This is a manipulative way to secure staff by offering a place at a high school which is likely to be out of area for where they live. It is discriminatory to those parents who do not work in the teaching profession and is a total disregard to community and local school places for local children. It places all children currently at other local junior schools who currently live in the catchment area at a disadvantage. Parents have purchased houses specifically for schools only now to have places given to children out of area just because their parents work at the school. Totally unacceptable.
231	Agree		I agree because the children are still young, and it's all about convenience of dropping young children off and picking up after school. This is a general opinion, not related to any school.
232	Disagree		
233	Neutral		
234	Neutral		
235	Disagree		
236	Disagree		
237	Disagree		I strongly disagree with this as this breaks basic principles of democracy of equal access for everyone to the education in the UK. It's been a precedent to select students based on the catchment areas. Many parents have invested a lot of money to buy properties close to the school they believe in.
238	Agree		
239	Agree		
240	Neutral		
241	Disagree		
242	Disagree		I would find it hard to justify preferential admissions policies for staff working at the school that could impact local children missing out on a school place. In practice it could mean children living several miles away trumping local kids for a school place.
243	Neutral		
244	Agree		

245	Neutral		
246	Disagree		
247	Agree		Would be convenient for teachers, make them stay at particular school, _x000D_ Primary children cannot get to school on their own
248	Disagree		
249	Agree		
250	Agree		
251	Disagree		
252	Disagree		It is unfair and non inclusive on other children in the local area
253	Disagree		
254	Neutral		
255	Disagree		This is totally not fair to the children attending the other schools!
256	Agree		
257	Disagree		
258	Disagree		
259	Neutral		
260	Neutral		
261	Disagree		
262	Neutral		
263	Agree		
264	Disagree		
265	Disagree		
266	Disagree		This indicates a priority across the trust which is unfair and unnecessary. Children of staff at primary schools should have priority at their own primary school but NOT at the secondary schools
267	Disagree		
268	Disagree		
269	Disagree		
270	Disagree		
271	Disagree		
272	Disagree		
273	Disagree		This constitutes positive discrimination. I would think this could be unlawful.
274	Agree		
275	Neutral		
276	Neutral		
277	Disagree		
278	Neutral		
279	Agree		
280	Neutral		
281	Disagree		
282	Disagree		
283	Disagree		Local children need access to local Primary schools. it wasn't a good idea.
284	Disagree		I do not believe that children of staff should receive priority over children who live proximate to the school.
285	Disagree		
286	Agree		
287	Disagree		
288	Disagree		
289	Agree		
290	Agree		
291	Neutral		
292	Agree		
293	Disagree		

294	Agree		
295	Disagree		
296	Disagree		
297	Agree		
298	Neutral		I think it makes perfect sense that the children of staff be given priority. It makes their life easier and as such they can better care for all the other children.
299	Neutral		
300	Disagree		
301	Agree		
302	Disagree		It should be fair for the residents in the catchment area to apply and be given a place.
303	Not Applicable		My daughter is at LPGS already but my son is at Unicorn and his first choice school for September 2021 will be LPBS. Therefore this question na
304	Disagree		This shouldn't happen. If they want to move to the area then fine. Otherwise no. This is unfair on applicants in the area
305	Disagree		
306	Disagree		I disagree it's for the purpose of recruiting and retaining quality staff, it's best to recruit people who genuinely want to work there, without an ulterior motive? Surely
307	Disagree		Many staff members do not live near the school this would mean there would be excessive traffic which is also bad for the environment
308	Neutral		
309	Disagree		I disagree with this because of the precedent it sets, given the MAT could well expand in size over the coming years. I would be fine with giving staff priority at the primary school they teach at.
310	Agree		
311	Disagree		
312	Neutral		
313	Not Applicable		
314	Neutral		
315	Disagree		
316	Agree		
317	Disagree		
318	Agree		
319	Disagree		
320	Disagree		
321	Disagree		I don't see why staff should have this advantage. Other parents have to use school clubs, child minders etc to cover out of school hours and travel. I think it is discrimination
322	Neutral		
323	Agree		
324	Disagree		
325	Agree		
326	Disagree		
327	Neutral		
328	Neutral		
329	Agree		Makes perfect sense to enhance quality staff retention
330	Neutral		
331	Agree		
332	Neutral		
333	Neutral		
334	Agree		
335	Agree		
336	Disagree		
337	Disagree		
338	Neutral		
339	Disagree		
340	Disagree		
341	Neutral		
342	Disagree		

343	Neutral		
344	Disagree		
345	Disagree		
346	Neutral		
347	Disagree		No consideration has taken place to families who have specifically moved house to get into a secondary school who do not attend one of the named feeder schools. If this plan was to be approved and implemented in 5 years time to allow those families the ability to not be impacted by the new rules and other families the option to choose a primary school based on the secondary school choice. It will also have a huge impact on other secondary schools in the area. Will they also want to choose feeder schools from their own trust and thus remove any options for families that do not attend feeder school or live on the doorstep.
348	Agree		
349	Disagree		
350	Neutral		
351	Neutral		If the parent/parents child attends Langley Primary school and they teach at any of these 3 schools, I think it is only fair that their children are given priority places.
352	Neutral		
353	Neutral		
354	Disagree		
355	Disagree		Because I feel it should be an equal playing field for all
356	Disagree		
357	Neutral		I think it's worth considering the environment in terms of travel and how children get to school and the condition of the local roads. Also what happens to children when they are tired, travelling longer distances to school rather than walking home with their friends. It brings in a different atmosphere to the schools when pupils from further away commute into school with or without their parents who are staff.
358	Agree		
359	Agree		
360	Neutral		
361	Agree		
362	Agree		
363	Agree		Makes sense if helps attract the best teachers
364	Disagree		Staff may live out of the area and places should be allocated to those who live near the school for the sake of the local community, and to avoid unnecessary congestion and pollution on the roads.
365	Disagree		
366	Disagree		
367	Agree		Will encourage staff retention and best staff
368	Disagree		
369	Neutral		
370	Neutral		
371	Disagree		
372	Agree		This seems to be a fair given the amount of extra time staff usually give. It also takes into account salary -v- cost of child care, which would be required for a child of primary school age.
373	Disagree		
374	Agree		
375	Disagree		
376	Disagree		
377	Disagree		Unfair and misleading in relation to the perceived benefits of retention. Is there any research to validate this proposal/ set of proposals and measured over time? Recruiting and retaining quality staff should be achieved through innovative workplace policies/ work life balance, staff development and remuneration that is in line with sector pay. Staff working in HE/ FE do not get preferential treatment in the form of prioritisation over others. Access to education should be fair and focus on what they stand for: academic merit, scholastic aptitude, giving talented young children opportunities to grow and further their potential and a chance for all children to benefit. Using valuable school places to better staff retention and recruitment goes against the ethos of an educational system and sets a very wrong precedent!
378	Disagree		
379	Agree		
380	Disagree		
381	Agree		

382	Agree		
383	Disagree		This does not seem relevant to the position of the child at secondary school.
384	Neutral		
385	Agree		
386	Agree		
387	Disagree		
388	Disagree		
389	Disagree		
390	Neutral		
391	Not Applicable		
392	Disagree		
393	Disagree		What is to stop a parent from being a teacher at one of the Primary schools, getting their child into the secondary school and then leaving their employment. This is unfair to other families in the area who live close by who wish their child to go to their local secondary school.
394	Neutral		
395	Disagree		
396	Disagree		
397	Agree		
398	Neutral		
399	Neutral		
400	Neutral		
401	Disagree		
402	Disagree		
403	Disagree		
404	Agree		
405	Not Applicable		
406	Disagree		
407	Neutral		
408	Not Applicable		
409	Agree		
410	Disagree		
411	No Response		
412	Neutral		
413	Disagree		
414	Disagree		
415	Disagree		
416	Agree		
417	Agree		Just those children of LPPS staff.
418	Disagree		
419	Disagree		
420	Disagree		
421	Disagree		
422	No Response		
423	Disagree		
424	Agree		
425	Agree		
426	Disagree		
427	Disagree		
428	Neutral		
429	Disagree		
430	Not Applicable		

431	Disagree		
432	Neutral		
433	Disagree		
434	Disagree		
435	Neutral		
436	Neutral		
437	Disagree		
438	Disagree		While I don't disagree within the same school, but this is no different to nepotism.
439	No Response		
440	Disagree		This change will mean that the amount of children within the current catchment area. Will be significantly reduced, therefore denying the local housed children, a chance to attend the school. Due to the fact that staff could live outside of the area.
441	Disagree		
442	Agree		
443	Agree		This improves the wellbeing of both teachers with children, and the children themselves, who would otherwise be juggling with childcare arrangements necessary if attending different schools.
444	Agree		Given the ages of children at primary school, I would not object to placements given priority on this basis
445	Agree		
446	Disagree		
447	Agree		
448	Disagree		
449	Disagree		
450	Disagree		
451	Disagree		
452	Neutral		
453	Agree		
454	Disagree		I do not agree that children of staff at the feeder schools should be treated differently to staff at other local primary schools. This could cause other schools to have difficulty recruiting and retaining good staff which is not good for the local children
455	Agree		
456	Agree		
457	Disagree		
458	Disagree		
459	Disagree		Children should have equal rights, if the staff works at the actual school, my answer would be yes, but I don't agree with 'feeder schools'!
460	Disagree		
461	Agree		In this time of teacher shortages any steps that can be taken to retain excellent and loyal staff can only be a good thing.
462	Neutral		
463	Agree		
464	Neutral		
465	No Response		
466	Neutral		
467	Not Applicable		
468	Disagree		
469	Agree		
470	Disagree		
471	Disagree		
472	Disagree		
473	Disagree		
474	Disagree		Priority should be given to local children. Distance as the crow flies. Schools are built to serve the communities directly around them, not for staff who could be travelling an hour to work everyday!
475	Agree		
476	Disagree		
477	Disagree		

478	Not Applicable		
479	Agree		
480	Disagree		
481	Disagree		Agree for LPPS only
482	Disagree		
483	Neutral		
484	Disagree		
485	Agree		
486	Not Applicable		
487	Agree		
488	Disagree		
489	Neutral		
490	Neutral		
491	Agree		I think it is fair to offer children of staff employed at a school access to that school.
492	Agree		Young children need to be dropped to school. This will help the parents/teachers enormously and would help retain teachers for at least the period their child attends.
493	Disagree		
494	Agree		This is often the case to give preference to children if staff
495	Agree		
496	Not Applicable		
497	Disagree		
498	Agree		
499	Neutral		I agree with this but think it should only relate to teaching staff.
500	No Response		Where is the fairness in this _x000D_ People geographically nearer in Eden Park need to be considered
501	Disagree		
502	Disagree		
503	Disagree		
504	Disagree		
505	Not Applicable		
506	Neutral		
507	Neutral		
508	Agree		
509	Agree		
510	Neutral		
511	Disagree		
512	Neutral		
513	Disagree		I feel that all children in the area should have an equal chance of admission rather than whether your parent works at one of the schools. This gives unfair advantage for admission to children that live further away from the school. I am not a teacher so I have no extra right for my child to attend one of the schools so this seems very unfair. The argument that this will help retain staff members does not seem a strong argument as the school is in a relatively safe and pleasant area with parents being very supportive of the local schools.
514	Disagree		
515	Disagree		
516	Disagree		
517	Disagree		
518	Agree		
519	Disagree		
520	Agree		Staff should benefit from working in a trust , they also should be helped with childcare
521	Neutral		Staff needed to have assurance and if helps retain good staff. Small numbers apply anyway.
522	Disagree		
523	Agree		
524	Disagree		

525	Disagree		
526	Disagree		
527	Disagree		
528	Agree		
529	Not Applicable		
530	Disagree		
531	No Response		
532	Disagree		
533	Agree		, I see the benefits of giving priority to staff members children as this not only helps teacher retention but also I feel sets a fantastic example to other pupils and parents of staff are willing to send their own children to that school.
534	Agree		
535	Neutral		
536	Neutral		
537	Disagree		
538	Disagree		It should give priority to children that live closest to the school
539	Agree		
540	Disagree		
541	Neutral		
542	Agree		
543	Neutral		
544	Neutral		
545	Disagree		
546	Neutral		
547	Agree		
548	Disagree		
549	Neutral		
550	Disagree		
551	Agree		
552	Agree		
553	Disagree		Local schools should be for local people. Local people pay local taxes, which pay for the schools. There will be a negative impact on the environment, if children who could have walked to school will now need to be driven. Parents have planned and paid a considerable amount of money for their homes to be near Langley, are now at risk of not securing a place in Langley. Everyone knows that parents sensibly invest alot to move to area, often sacrificing better, cheaper housing stock elsewhere. To ignore this, as if it does not matter is unacceptable. We as a family love Langley girls school and appreciate it's ability to bring out the best in children. We moved as close as we can given the housing sock available over 7 years ago to get a place. We even have the uniform as we are applying next year. It is heartbreaking and worrying to think that our daughter will not get in as a result of this change. My daughter is excited to hopefully go to such a wonderful school.
554	Not Applicable		
555	Agree		
556	Disagree		
557	Disagree		This is not far, especially if they do not live in the catchment area. There son or daughter my subjected to special treatment.
558	Agree		It seems justified as a means of recruiting and retaining staff and giving them a greater personal stake in the schools they work at.
559	Not Applicable		
560	Not Applicable		I can understand the benefit of offering this as a benefit to teachers as it would aid with staff retention and recruitment. However, the proposal does not indicate the number of children per year this would be, therefore the potential impact in unknown.
561	Neutral		
562	Disagree		This is totally ridiculous and goes entirely against free access to education for children born and raised in the local area_x000D_ _x000D_ It is an absolute disgrace that Langley are even considering such a proposition and I will be speaking with my councillor , MP and anyone else who can shame or force you into another course of action
563	Disagree		
564	Disagree		This does not give an indication of the possible number per year. As the Impact is unknown I disagree with this proposal

565	Disagree		
566	Disagree		
567	Disagree		
568	Disagree		
569	Agree		I agree that children of staff should be given admission priority in order to attract and retain valuable staff.
570	Agree		
571	Neutral		
572	Disagree		Its is irrelevant where parents work - and also better to be at a separate school
573	Neutral		
574	Neutral		There needs to be quotas on the number of children of staff who will be able to have priority to Langley Park schools
575	No Response		
576	Not Applicable		
577	Disagree		It would mean that a very large number of teachers would get first choice as it is teachers from all the schools in the MAT as I understand. Unfair in my view.
578	Neutral		
579	Agree		
580	Agree		
581	Neutral		
582	Disagree		
583	Neutral		I am happy for a member of staff to have priority for there child at the school they work in.
584	Disagree		
585	Agree		
586	Disagree		
587	Agree		
588	Agree		
589	Agree		
590	Agree		
591	Agree		I agree that staff who work at one of the Primary schools should have priority to send their children to the school they work at but NOT for the secondary school._x000D_ And similarly, staff who work at one of the Secondary schools should have priority to send their children to the school they work at but NOT for the primary schools.
592	Disagree		
593	Neutral		
594	Neutral		Provided this relates to that particular school only
595	Agree		
596	Neutral		
597	Disagree		
598	Neutral		
599	Neutral		It’s fair for teachers to have their children at the same school
600	Neutral		
601	Disagree		
602	Disagree		
603	Disagree		
604	Disagree		
605	Disagree		
606	Disagree		
607	Neutral		
608	Neutral		
609	Disagree		
610	Disagree		
611	Neutral		
612	Disagree		I don’t feel it will be fair to other children in the current catchment area at all.
613	Agree		

614	Agree		
615	Agree		It seems fair and reasonable for a child of a parent teaching at that school to be given priority advantage to be admitted to that school. It would not be fair and reasonable for a child of a primary teacher to be given priority in this way for LPBS or LPGS.
616	Agree		
617	Neutral		
618	Neutral		
619	Not Applicable		
620	Disagree		
621	Disagree		
622	Agree		
623	Neutral		
624	Neutral		
625	Neutral		
626	Disagree		
627	Neutral		Will this impact the quality of teachers in certain schools in the area? Staff may only work in feeder primary schools rather than the ones who need it.
628	Agree		Good for recruitment of quality staff to the primary schools_x000D_ Practical proposal which enables staff to drop off and pick up their own children at their workplace, reducing the need for additional childcare
629	Neutral		
630	Agree		
631	Disagree		They don't work at the school. Why should they have priority._x000D_ I strongly object
632	Neutral		
633	Disagree		
634	Disagree		
635	Disagree		
636	Neutral		
637	Agree		
638	Neutral		
639	Agree		
640	Neutral		
641	Disagree		I think it is absolutely disgusting to single out certain schools for preferential treatment, you should be ashamed of yourselves, people that live closest to the school should get in first, then siblings, that makes sense, instead you want the brightest children in your schools, shame on you! It's all about Ofsted's results! It's the local children that should come first, not your results!!!
642	Disagree		
643	Disagree		
644	Agree		With the aim of recruiting and retaining quality staff at the primary schools.
645	Disagree		
646	Disagree		I disagree with this because if the local children near to Langley Park School cannot go there this will mean them travelling further by bus or car or train. It may also cause the people in the trust having to use public transport to arrive at the school. Surely this is adding to our carbon footprint .
647	Disagree		
648	Disagree		
649	Neutral		
650	Disagree		
651	Not Applicable		
652	Agree		
653	Neutral		
654	Disagree		I don't see how where a teacher works in a primary school has a bearing on where their child should go when going to secondary school
655	Agree		
656	Neutral		
657	Disagree		
658	Disagree		I don't believe they should be given priority into the secondary schools if they are teaching at primary schools.

659	Neutral		
660	Neutral		
661	Neutral		
662	Agree		Appreciate the difference this can make in attracting and retaining the best staff, and that this is not an unusual arrangement.
663	Disagree		LPSB admissions criteria should not be changed as was promised by the MAT before LPSB became part of LPLT.
664	Disagree		This seems unfair if they want to go to these schools they should move to the area like the rest of us have to. And what stops a staff member working at a school for a short period to gain a school place and then leaving. Places should be reserved for the normal entry criteria and then as per distance.
665	Disagree		
666	Agree		
667	Neutral		
668	No Response		
669	Neutral		
670	No Response		
671	Agree		I think this would increase talent from which the school can choose teachers
672	Agree		A sensible suggestion to assist with recruitment and retention of staff.
673	Disagree		This will mean children travelling further to get to school (often in cars and yes unfortunately a huge amount of parents do drive their children to secondary) it would also disadvantage those living close to the school but attending closer primaries which seems unfair. It seems a very undemocratic approach to school admission and with more than a whiff of social engineering.
674	Neutral		
675	Neutral		
676	Agree		
677	Disagree		They do not directly work for the schools. Therefore I don't see why they should get priority over others. they have the benefit of priority in their existing primary schools already.
678	Disagree		
679	Neutral		
680	Disagree		
681	Disagree		
682	Agree		As long as they live within a reasonable distance to the school.
683	Disagree		
684	Agree		
685	Agree		
686	Disagree		
687	Disagree		
688	Disagree		
689	Agree		
690	Disagree		All working parents have to arrange before and after school care and i do not see why this should be any different because your parent works at the school - everyone should attend their local school.
691	Disagree		
692	Agree		
693	Disagree		unfair to local children who have the right to go to a local school
694	Neutral		
695	Agree		
696	Agree		
697	Agree		Seems reasonable standard practice - a perk by way of employment package.
698	Disagree		
699	Disagree		
700	Disagree		It should be based on distance from school. Those children will be further and they will put pressure on the area at school times with parents dropping off.
701	Neutral		I appreciate the need for working parents to be able to fit their careers around their family life, especially when the children are young but this is weighted with the belief that schools should serve the local community first and foremost. If this policy were to be adopted, it should be capped at a number or % of places and available to full time staff only.
702	Disagree		Allowing priority to children of staff across all schools (primary and secondary) in the consultation reduced the choice for other local children
703	Disagree		
704	Agree		

705	Disagree		Local schools should be for local children. Staff at the schools do not necessarily live close to the school. As a former teacher I do not think it a good thing for children to attend the school where their parent teaches. Far better for them to attend a local school.
706	Disagree		
707	Agree		
708	Agree		
709	Neutral		
710	Neutral		
711	Agree		
712	Disagree		This shouldn't be considered at all because you are staff of the primary school not the secondary school.
713	Not Applicable		
714	Neutral		
715	Neutral		
716	Agree		
717	Neutral		
718	Disagree		
719	Agree		
720	Agree		
721	Disagree		Disproportionate for local children given limited and oversubscribed school places.
722	Disagree		I accept that teachers who work at langley school should have preference but not all schools in the group.
723	Disagree		
724	Agree		
725	Disagree		
726	Disagree		This will mean children living near to the school will have to travel further to another school. How ridiculous. That means more traffic on the local roads and girls walking further alone, even in the dark. This is another form of selection that only disadvantages girls who have for years looked forward to their futures at their nearest closest school. My son goes to Langley Park Boys and would be walking his sister home in her first year. I as a working mum have been depending on this as a form of safety for my girl. If she has to travel away from him, it tears families further apart.
727	Disagree		
728	Agree		yes, it is good for retaining teachers across the trust
729	Disagree		
730	Disagree		
731	Disagree		
732	Disagree		Removing proximity would be very unfair to the local community...simply unethical
733	Disagree		The need to retain staff at primary schools is not as acute as that for good staff at secondary schools, and is an unfair benefit over local families. Furthermore the definition of staff should be reviewed as otherwise "feeder primary schools" would see huge numbers of part-time TAs to gain the benefit of admissions to LPBS & LPGS.
734	Agree		
735	Neutral		
736	Disagree		
737	Neutral		It would make it easier for staff to care for their children thus making staff attendance more robust.
738	Disagree		
739	Neutral		I appreciate this is beneficial for staff retention - however it's not clear on the number of possible places this will have effect on.
740	Agree		
741	Agree		
742	Neutral		
743	Disagree		
744	Neutral		
745	Disagree		
746	Neutral		
747	Neutral		

748	Disagree		local school places should be offered to local children. It changes the community spirit when people are bussed in from far afield. I also don't think it's good for those children to have to travel to maintain out of school friendships. I think they often feel isolated. (based on personal experience of having moved away from my school, then finding my friends were all together and able to visit each other's houses easily, when I could not)
749	Disagree		
750	Agree		
751	Neutral		
752	Disagree		
753	Agree		
754	Disagree		I disagree with the feeder school arrangement so by definition disagree with this. However this criteria is particularly bizarre as teachers often prefer to travel a little to work to have some distance between their pupils home locations to create some distance between work and home life.
755	Agree		
756	Disagree		
757	Disagree		
758	Neutral		
759	Agree		
760	Neutral		
761	Disagree		
762	Agree		Staff should have some kind of privilege for them to have a reason to preform well rather than just duty bound
763	Agree		
764	Agree		
765	Neutral		
766	Disagree		When you started the MAT processes the consultation was very LOW KEY . Indeed you did your very best to slip the MAT change thro' without power debate. In further discussion I believe you made it very clear that you would NOT change the admissions policy._x000D_ I distinctly remember the Head Master (Mr Parsons) and the Chair of the governors stating that there were NO plans to change the admissions policy !!!!!_x000D_ NOW during the election / christmas period you are trying to railroad this policy change through. _x000D_ It's disgraceful. _x000D_ I wonder how many parents local to LPSB realise they could get crowded out by pupils from Claire house or Hawes down
767	Disagree		
768	Disagree		
769	Neutral		
770	Disagree		
771	Disagree		A properly functioning state school system should allow children to attend the schools closest to where they live, not employing some closed-circuit system of grace and favour more akin to the privileged public school system.
772	Agree		
773	Disagree		
774	Agree		
775	Neutral		
776	Not Applicable		
777	No Response		
778	Disagree		
779	Agree		
780	Agree		
781	Agree		
782	Neutral		
783	Neutral		
784	Disagree		
785	Agree		Makes sense if would help staff retention - continuity is better for the pupils
786	Neutral		
787	Disagree		

788	Disagree		<p>The Code sets out at paragraph 1.39 that admission authorities may give priority in their oversubscription criteria to children of staff in either or both of the following circumstances _x000D_ _x000D_ a) where the member of staff has been employed at the school for two or more years at the time at which the application for admission to the school is made; and/or_x000D_ b) the member of staff is recruited to fill a vacant post for which there is a demonstrable skill shortage._x000D_ _x000D_ The Consultation notice is a little light on the wording (reference is simply made to the &lsquo;children of staff&hellip;&rsquo;) but the proposed arrangements contain the correct wording._x000D_ _x000D_ There are difficulties with the proposed arrangements for each of the two secondary schools, where the relevant oversubscription category extends to the children of staff at the other secondary school._x000D_ _x000D_ Our view is the Code does not allow for an extension of this type: the Code permits priority to children of staff &lsquo;at the school&rsquo; only. we are aware of at least one Adjudicator decision which ruled against a multi academy trust applying the LPLT proposed approach. _x000D_ _x000D_ We would be prepared to seek a view from the OSA on this point.</p>
789	Disagree		
790	Neutral		
791	Neutral		
792	Agree		
793	Disagree		
794	Neutral		No comments.
795	Disagree		Admission should be based on geographical location
796	Disagree		
797	Agree		
798	Disagree		It is not fair that a teacher could live well out of our area and borough yet take one or more spaces for their children at one of our local Secondary schools.
799	Neutral		This is a common policy at schools, and I feel does not have a huge impact on the number of places available to others. It would seem to make a lot of sense for teachers to have their children in the same school.
800	Agree		For Primary Schools it is sensible to give children of staff priority. The children need to be taken to school and it may be helpful for staff who need to get to school early to be able to take their children who them. So this is a sensible, practical change.
801	Disagree		I completely disagree as this would effect the school my son would attend. He is currently at Marian vian
802	Disagree		
803	Disagree		<p>The consultation states that this proposal is being made with the aim of recruiting and retaining quality staff to the trust's primary schools, but this will have the negative impact of limiting even further the number of spaces available based on proximity alone to the secondary schools. Fairness in this case would be in question._x000D_ The only exception could be made for children of staff at LPPS as it is on the same campus as the secondary schools. This would be for the convenience of staff at LPPS and their children, and would also have the positive result of increasing shared journeys to and from the campus with benefits to health and the environment.</p>
804	Disagree		<p>The consultation states that this proposal is being made with the aim of recruiting and retaining quality staff to the trust's primary schools, but this will have the negative impact of limiting even further the number of spaces available based on proximity alone to the secondary schools. Fairness in this case would be in question._x000D_ The only exception could be made for children of staff at LPPS as it is on the same campus as the secondary schools. This would be for the convenience of staff at LPPS and their children, and would also have the positive result of increasing shared journeys to and from the campus with benefits to health and the environment.</p>
805	Neutral		
806	Disagree		I understand giving priority to children of staff employed at the school they teach at to make things more convenient for those staff, but that concept would not apply to staff from other schools in the trust at varying locations
807	Agree		The numbers involved must be relatively immaterial.
808	Neutral		
809	Agree		I'm on overall agreement with the proposal for children of staff who are contracted to do at least two days a week in the primary schools.
810	Agree		
811	Disagree		
812	Disagree		
813	Agree		This should only apply to the primary school admission policy.
814	Agree		
815	Disagree		

816	Disagree		As Bromley schools admission criteria is on a distance-to-school basis we feel that it is unfair to penalise children who live closer to the Langley Park secondary schools but who do not attend the proposed feeder Primary schools. There are a number of other Primary schools, such as Unicorn, Marian Vian and Pickhurst which are closer to the Langley Secondary schools than some of the proposed primary feeder schools. We think if the proposed change was to go ahead it risks creating an admission black hole for those living closest to the schools but not attending the proposed feeder schools. We feel children that attend a secondary school close to where they live is better for the local community and has less impact environmentally due to lower travel demands. We strongly oppose having any Primary feeder schools to the Langley Park Secondaries.
817	Neutral		
818	Disagree		There is no justifiable reason to support this. This could mean children living miles away are able to get priority over children living far closer_x000D_ Teachers in primary school are making no contribution to the secondary school and the argument that they are travelling to the same site is not relevant given that only one of the schools is on site.
819	Disagree		
820	Agree		
821	Not Applicable		
822	Disagree		I do not feel this would be fair.
823	Agree		
824	Disagree		It would limit opportunities for local kids
825	Disagree		Joining the staff of a primary school should be because you wish to be part of that school and not because you wish your child to have an advantage over other children in securing a particular secondary school place
826	Disagree		Whilst I think it is reasonable that children of staff at the secondary schools should have priority I see no justification for the same privilege being given to staff of primary schools which I strongly disagree with having any priority. Please refer to my comments below.
827	Neutral		
828	Disagree		I think that state secondary schools should give priority to local children. This supports community cohesion and facilitates access to education, extra curricular academic offers as well as social events.
829	Disagree		While I appreciate that it may assist with recruitment I have found from experience that it has caused difficulties having children of teachers in the school as it seriously compromises confidentiality (teacher/pupil confidentiality as items are discussed at home) and there is associated favouritism and conversely kids being avoided due to their parent being a teacher. On balance I think the negatives outweigh the positives.
830	Agree		
831	Disagree		
832	Disagree		
833	Agree		
834	Agree		
835	Agree		To support teachers
836	Agree		
837	Neutral		
838	Agree		
839	Agree		
840	Disagree		
841	Agree		It seems reasonable that teachers are able to have their children at the school they work at, should they so wish, given the number of times parents need to attend school for events and the inevitable issues this causes for teachers themselves.
842	Disagree		Teachers do not necessarily live close to their place of work and work longer hours than pupils attend school, so there is no need or relevance for a child to go to the same school as their parent.
843	Neutral		
844	Disagree		
845	Disagree		In order to support local community infrastructure, to reduce dependence on private car trips, to encourage diverse child friendships/social interaction, it is reasonable to assume all children should be able to walk to school. Local schools should be safeguarded for local children.
846	Agree		
847	Neutral		
848	Agree		Allows shared vision throughout the trust and easier transition for students
849	Disagree		Clearly nepotism. How can this possibly be justified?
850	Disagree		
851	Neutral		

852	Agree		
853	Disagree		
854	Agree		
855	Disagree		
856	Disagree		
857	Disagree		
858	Disagree		
859	Agree		
860	Disagree		
861	Disagree		
862	Agree		
863	No Response		
864	Disagree		this would be inequitable in terms of access and disadvantageous in terms of recruitment and retention of staff at other primary and secondary schools in the borough. I disagree with this elitist policy.
865	Disagree		
866	Disagree		The proposal is illogical across primary and secondary schools especially when they are in different locations.
867	No Response		
868	Disagree		
869	Agree		
870	Agree		
871	Disagree		There is no reason why children of staff should receive priority treatment. Everyone should be treated equally.
872	Agree		
873	Neutral		
874	Disagree		
875	Disagree		All children are equal. There should not be a priority due to parents careers.
876	Disagree		
877	Disagree		
878	Disagree		Why should staff's children get priority over local children? This is not preferable as local children should get priority after siblings and looked after children.
879	Disagree		
880	Agree		
881	Neutral		
882	Disagree		This proposal is clearly discriminatory, in particular it places at a disadvantage any child who lives locally but whose parents are not employed by the primary school.
883	Disagree		There are many other schools in the area. The children that attend these schools should not be unfairly disadvantaged in their application to either Langley Park secondary schools.
884	Disagree		
885	Disagree		This is unfair and damaging. It will break the link between the local community and Langley Schools. Proximity is a fairer and more environmental admission criteria.
886	Agree		
887	Neutral		
888	Agree		I SUPPORT PROVIDING IMPROVED WORKPLACE BENEFITS FOR TEACHERS, PARTICULARLY GIVEN THAT MANY TEACHERS CANNOT AFFORD TO LIVE IN AREAS WHERE THEY TEACH. HOWEVER, THIS BENEFIT ALONE WILL NOT RESOLVE THE CRISIS IN TEACHER RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION, AND LPLT SHOULD DO MORE TO ADDRESS THE ROOT CAUSES OF THIS SITUATION WITH GOVERNMENT.
889	Disagree		Please see other comments section.
890	Disagree		In any other profession, parents have to make provision for childcare. I do not agree that children of staff employed at the primary schools should be a priority to maintain "recruiting and retaining quality staff". Initially when a vacancy arises within the school the candidates apply for the job advertisement and would have made childcare provision at this point-I assume the person chosen would be of "quality".
891	Agree		Ease of childcare and loyalty of staff
892	Disagree		This seems unfair that children will be deprived of a local school places when the school places in question are not on the same campus. I cant see how this helps in anyway other way than use as an employee benefit for future hires of staff.
893	Disagree		
894	Neutral		
895	Disagree		

896	Disagree		
897	Agree		
898	Disagree		
899	Not Applicable		
900	Disagree		
901	Disagree		
902	Neutral		
903	Agree		
904	Disagree		This consultation is unfair and not needed. No priority should be given to feeder schools, and admission should remain on a catchment/geographical area only.
905	Disagree		
906	Neutral		
907	Disagree		
908	Disagree		
909	Neutral		I believe this has always been the case for children of staff to get priority admission if the member of staff has completed a certain length of service
910	Disagree		I strongly believe the primary schools places should be for local children. This is important for them feeling part of the local community. If we want a cohesive society where we can walk, bike and scoot to our local school (and not drive) we must preserve this fundamental right. Close contact also is good for the mental health of students and parents alike supporting each other.
911	Disagree		
912	Neutral		
913	Disagree		Conflict of interest
914	Agree		I think this is a good idea and would assist in attracting high quality teachers/ as being a teacher/parent and being in the situation where they are dropping their own children to a different school would present childcare issues. Also if a teachers own children attend the school then there is greater / vested interest by the teachers to ensure that standards are maintained over and above it simply being their job.
915	Disagree		Primary school children need to be taken and collected from school so i understand that teachers who are parents may want children to attend the school they teach in however secondary school children are old enough to independently travel to school and I suspect would prefer to do so. Therefore I dont understand why it would be necessary for this criteria.
916	Agree		
917	Disagree		
918	Disagree		
919	Disagree		Disagree, as this will mean children from further afield will be travelling to the school. That will increase the number of people travelling by car and bus, reducing the current amount of pupils, the majority of which, currently walk to the schools. That will then, in turn, mean that those displaced children in the current catchment area, will be forced to travel by car and bus to other schools. These changes will, therefore, greatly increase traffic congestion and increase carbon emission' which all authorities are attempting to reduce. There is also the national policy of encouraging children to get active, in an attempt to reduce the increasing obesity epidemic. Walking to school is beneficial to children' health and removing the option to walk to school for many children is negative. Why does LPLT think they are exempt from actively supporting these national almost global policies?_x000D_ Not to ignore the fact that we moved to Goodhart Way, paying inflated prices as we wanted our son to attend your excellent school. I urge you to re think changing the current admission policy.
920	Agree		
921	Disagree		
922	Neutral		
923	Disagree		
924	Disagree		
925	Agree		
926	Agree		It will be more convenient for staff to bring their child to same school they work in.
927	Disagree		
928	Neutral		
929	Neutral		
930	Disagree		
931	Disagree		Local schools for local children
932	Disagree		
933	Agree		
934	Disagree		Children should be able to go to their nearest School
935	Agree		

936	Disagree		
937	Neutral		
938	Disagree		This reduces the admission of pupils within the area who are attending other primary schools.
939	Neutral		
940	Neutral		
941	Agree		
942	Disagree		
943	Neutral		
944	Disagree		
945	Disagree		
946	Disagree		
947	Disagree		
948	Disagree		
949	Disagree		
950	Disagree		
951	Disagree		We cannot see why children of staff of a particular primary school should be given priority for the secondary schools, over and above children that actually live in the local area.
952	Neutral		
953	Disagree		The schools are meant to be representative of the community they are in. Giving priority to children of staff dilutes this. If this was to go ahead, I would want provisions to make sure children of all staff (including but not limited to; receptionists, teaching assistants, cleaners, janitors ect) are given equal priority. Giving one such group priority or denying another such group would stink of elitist nepotism and be grossly unfair.
954	Disagree		
955	Agree		
956	Neutral		
957	Disagree		Unless a child has a medical or social need it is unfair to give a school place outside of their proximity area. My son did not get into our nearest primary school 0.4 miles away due to high sibling intake. Giving school staff priority would impact access to local children.
958	Disagree		Wholeheartedly disagree. The Current Oversubscription Criteria is sufficient and priority should only be given to children of staff at that particular school. I.e. teacher parents of pupils at LPSB and LPSG should have priority access for their child, providing they live within the catchment area.
959	Neutral		
960	Disagree		Many local residents have moved to be within the catchment area and this will mean more cars travelling within the vicinity of the school as many would not normally be within walking distance.
961	Disagree		
962	Disagree		
963	Disagree		
964	Neutral		
965	Disagree		I don't think this should be a perk of the job for any school. I understand that it may be handy for a teachers child to get a place, but the criteria for getting the job is not based on proximity to the school. They are likely to live greater distances than those who would be eligible under the current catchment system.
966	Agree		
967	Agree		I think it probably makes logistical sense, helps with staff retention and is reasonably easy to work around in terms of making sure the parent and child's path don't cross
968	Disagree		Why should they? Senior school children should go to a school in the local area to where they live.
969	Disagree		on what basis is that fair on the children in the local area?
970	Agree		
971	Disagree		All parents be they employed by the education department or not have to send their children to school. As a working parent, I have no choice in a school located to my place of employment. This 'perk' should be available to all council employees, police officers, nhs workers and firefighters to keep this fair and unbiased.
972	Neutral		
973	Disagree		
974	Agree		
975	Disagree		
976	Agree		Makes sense for any school including this as part of their admissions arrangements, though these primary schools probably have little difficulty in attracting staff!
977	Neutral		

978	Neutral		
979	Agree		
980	Disagree		
981	Disagree		
982	Neutral		
983	Disagree		
984	Neutral		
985	Disagree		It would be both unethical and unfair to give admission priority to the children of staff members of the primary schools concerned. State schools are state provisions designed to serve their local communities and staff members should be treated in the same way as any other parents of would-be pupils, i.e. by distance from the school or sibling priority. The benefits and perks of their jobs are surely already applied and received in other, more appropriate, areas.
986	Disagree		
987	Agree		
988	Disagree		
989	Neutral		
990	Disagree		This gives those children an advantage over children in the community and state education should not be based on favouritism to staff.
991	Agree		I would think this was a natural given that their children would gain automatic entry and honestly don't see it as an issue.
992	Disagree		
993	Neutral		
994	Disagree		
995	Disagree		
996	Agree		
997	Neutral		
998	Agree		
999	Disagree		I feel that children from the local community who would otherwise be eligible for a place would be denied an opportunity to study at their local secondary school (Both Langley Boys and Girls) by children taking up spaces who live from far outside the area and strikes me as unfair when they lived in the area as have their families for a great deal of time.
1000	Agree		
1001	Disagree		I can see the benefits to this change but think overall it may be best to keep with the current admission arrangements for the primary schools.
1002	Agree		
1003	Agree		
1004	Disagree		Agree to children in the same school as their parent but not any of the other schools.
1005	Neutral		
1006	Disagree		
1007	Agree		
1008	Agree		
1009	Disagree		
1010	Disagree		
1011	Agree		
1012	Disagree		
1013	Agree		
1014	Disagree		
1015	Neutral		
1016	Disagree		Not fair - moving further away from equal access for local children.
1017	Agree		
1018	Disagree		
1019	Disagree		
1020	Neutral		
1021	Disagree		
1022	Agree		I feel that as a person whom is dedicated to educating children, that it may be difficult for them to take their own children to a different school and still arrive for work on time.
1023	No Response		
1024	Agree		

1025	Disagree		Staff members are not always local. Therefore more traffic around the Langley Schools, no sense of community anymore.
1026	Agree		
1027	Neutral		
1028	Disagree		
1029	Disagree		
1030	Disagree		
1031	Disagree		
1032	Agree		I agree with this proposal to assist staff employed at the school to have their own child educated in the same school group. This assists staff with child care arrangements when school holidays/inset days are not aligned with other schools outside the group and also should aid staff retention.
1033	Agree		
1034	Agree		
1035	Neutral		
1036	Disagree		Langley boys always over subscribed._x000D_ What about children from Oak Lodge??
1037	Neutral		
1038	Agree		This makes sense - to recruit for teachers from a broader radius.
1039	Neutral		
1040	Not Applicable		
1041	Agree		
1042	Agree		
1043	Disagree		
1044	Disagree		No child should be given preferential treatment over another based on who they know or are related to.
1045	Neutral		
1046	Disagree		I do not understand how this could be justified. It should be based on nearest proximity.
1047	Agree		Teachers and Teaching Assistants have long hours and if it makes it that little bit easier to have their child on site for drop off and pick up, then I believe this to be a nice 'perk.' I , which means my will have to go to a school close to me. It will make it a lot easier if she can
1048	Disagree		
1049	Disagree		Priority should be given for teaching staff for both schools but not all staff as it is good eaching staff that need to be recruited and retained
1050	Disagree		
1051	Disagree		
1052	Disagree		
1053	Disagree		You need to make it clear about which staff you mean. I understand that this policy would help with the recruitment of skilled, qualified teachers and I would support the policy if it stated "teaching staff." But there is not a recruitment crisis for teaching assistants, admin staff and midday supervisors. If you were to include the children of all staff employed by the schools then I think this would involve a high number of people and should not be allowed.
1054	Agree		
1055	Neutral		
1056	Neutral		
1057	Neutral		
1058	Disagree		
1059	Disagree		Their children should meet the criteria every other child has to follow. If they live further away a child more local should get the spot just like anyone else with jobs having to drop their children off before getting to work
1060	Disagree		We have had to buy in the over priced area of park Langley so our son goes to Langley. We don't feel that teachers children should get preference.
1061	Disagree		
1062	Agree		
1063	Agree		There should be some perks to working extremely hard in a busy diverse school
1064	Neutral		
1065	Neutral		
1066	Agree		
1067	Disagree		

1068	Disagree		My wife works at a different school to my son's school and although it complicates logistics, we manage and the policy is fair to the local community.
1069	Disagree		
1070	Disagree		
1071	Disagree		
1072	Not Applicable		
1073	Disagree		
1074	Neutral		
1075	Agree		I'm supportive of the proposal to give children of staff priority._x000D_ _x000D_ My preference would be to a max of 10% of the year total size with proximity to the school being the deciding factor if there are more applicants from staff members
1076	Disagree		Not fair on local children who live closer to the schools
1077	Disagree		Not fair on local children who live closer to the schools
1078	Disagree		
1079	Disagree		
1080	Neutral		
1081	Neutral		
1082	Agree		
1083	Disagree		
1084	Neutral		
1085	Disagree		
1086	Neutral		
1087	Disagree		
1088	Disagree		Staff move on to other jobs and often live out of borough therefore taking place from local children.
1089	Disagree		Oak Lodge
1090	Not Applicable		
1091	Not Applicable		
1092	Disagree		
1093	Agree		Keeps good teachers
1094	Agree		
1095	Neutral		
1096	Disagree		This would impact children within a closer vicinity who may not get a place, increase traffic congestion which is bad for the environment. People have made made long term financial committments with where they live which has taken into account schools._x000D_ _x000D_ I believe that this is against the ethos of local community schools and would have a negative impact on other existing catchment area schools. It could also lead to no local places for local children.
1097	Disagree		It is absolutely disgusting that children will be unable to attend their local school as other primary schools, located further away, are given priority. Parents and governors at Clare House are too self-centred and refuse to look at whether this is fair, they simply want to try and give their children a blatantly unfair leg up in the world.
1098	Disagree		I disagree with children out of catchment area having priority over eligible children in catchment unless there is a medical or social reason .
1099	Agree		
1100	Disagree		This should come down to proximity to the school first
1101	Disagree		Children of staff should be subject to the same criteria as everyone else
1102	Agree		
1103	Agree		I see how this could be very helpful to primary school teachers if their children were able to attend the same school as were they work. Primary school age children are unable to make their own way to and from school and also the number of primary school teachers is relatively low so I do not see this as having a huge negative impact on the remaining local children securing local primary school places.
1104	Neutral		
1105	Disagree		
1106	Disagree		
1107	Disagree		The proposed changes could potentially reduce the amount of places for local children, this will have an environmental impact as well as disadvantaging local children who may miss out on a place at a school within walking distance.

1108	Disagree		
1109	Disagree		<p>1. My daughter moved specifically into the area so that her daughter could go to this school. _x000D_</p> <p>2. These 3 primary schools are nowhere near the senior schools. Most of the children will need transport and it is just not right that because of this proposal local children could have to do the same. _x000D_</p> <p>3. Langley Park Learning Trust is paid for by the taxes of local people and therefore their children should take priority over the children of these 3 primary schools._x000D_</p> <p>4. Trustees and Academy's are required to follow the law and guidance on admissions, special needs and exclusions. In my opinion you are not following the spirit of the Department of Educations admission code which states that distance is more important than feeder schools. Once again in my opinion you are using a loophole in this code to change that. _x000D_</p> <p>6. Historically a feeder school has always been bottom of the pile in state schools. Distance has always taken priority. _x000D_</p> <p>7. The safety of my granddaughter is paramount. Langley will enable my granddaughter to walk to it without public transport and in the knowledge she has no major roads to cross.</p>
1110	Neutral		I understand that if there was going to be a feeder proposal then this could be a compromise.
1111	Not Applicable		
1112	Not Applicable		
1113	Agree		
1114	Disagree		<p>Balgowan_x000D_</p> <p>_x000D_</p> <p>We moved into Langley catchment to send our son to Langley boys and feel that should be honoured.</p>
1115	Neutral		
1116	Not Applicable		
1117	Disagree		
1118	Agree		
1119	Agree		
1120	Neutral		
1121	Neutral		I don't have a material issue with this as I know, as a working parent, how hard it is to juggle work and my children.
1122	Disagree		They already benefit from priority admission at the primary school. The balance of favour is already against parents within the existing catchment.
1123	Disagree		
1124	Neutral		
1125	Not Applicable		
1126	Disagree		All other parents who work in other industries need to get their children to a school so teacher/parents should not get priority for their own children to attend the school they work at. As if they leave the job and the child remains then the child is at a school that the parent isn't working. This should not be in place to entice a better class of teacher and for convenience of teachers.
1127	Disagree		
1128	Disagree		
1129	Disagree		
1130	Disagree		
1131	Agree		
1132	Disagree		
1133	Agree		
1134	Neutral		
1135	Agree		
1136	Agree		
1137	Agree		
1138	Not Applicable		
1139	Neutral		
1140	Not Applicable		
1141	Disagree		
1142	Agree		
1143	Disagree		places should be offered to local children only
1144	Not Applicable		
1145	Agree		
1146	Disagree		

1147	Disagree		
1148	Agree		
1149	Agree		
1150	Disagree		I think it's unfair and potentially flouts equality laws
1151	Disagree		
1152	Agree		
1153	Neutral		
1154	Neutral		
1155	Disagree		
1156	Disagree		
1157	Disagree		
1158	Neutral		
1159	Disagree		This is absolutely not fair.
1160	Neutral		
1161	Neutral		
1162	Neutral		
1163	Neutral		This is a common criteria introduced by many other primary schools. I personally disagree, but many schools now do this.
1164	Neutral		
1165	Disagree		
1166	Disagree		
1167	Disagree		Strongly disagree - massively unfair to other closer primary schools leaving family's no option but to have to relocate.
1168	Disagree		I feel this is unfair, I feel the catchment should be widened to allow Marian vian pupils to attend
1169	Disagree		
1170	Neutral		
1171	Neutral		
1172	Disagree		I think this scheme will increase traffic in the area ie Hayes children travelling all the way over to Langley boys/girls
1173	Not Applicable		
1174	Neutral		
1175	Neutral		
1176	Neutral		
1177	Neutral		
1178	Neutral		
1179	Disagree		
1180	Neutral		
1181	Neutral		
1182	Neutral		
1183	Disagree		I can understand possibly giving priority to staff at Langley secondary schools but strongly object to staff at primary schools getting priority to a secondary school they could live some distance from.
1184	Agree		
1185	Disagree		
1186	Agree		
1187	Disagree		
1188	Disagree		
1189	Disagree		This is an unnecessary arrangement in an already oversubscribed area. This offers no benefit to adult or child and instead a serious cause for concern should the member of staff live outside of the area. The child travelling to and from the school would increase burden on public transport or worse if travelling by car. In addition it is unacceptable that a local child should miss out on a place at a local school because that place is being offered as a 'perk' of the job.

1190	Disagree		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A local child should not miss out on a place at a local school due to a teacher (who may live at the area) being offered this as part of a recruitment package. There are plenty of other options which can tempt and retain people into teaching. This is an out of date solution to a very modern problem, schools are becoming more and more oversubscribed so this cannot continue. No information is provided detailing how long the teacher has to have been working with the trust to enjoy this benefit and how long they would have to stay. What is being proposed here is potentially a child could gain a place in a feeder school and then be entitled to education within the trust until they are 18 years of age, irrespective of where they live and if their parent is still working for the trust.
1191	Disagree		
1192	Disagree		
1193	Disagree		
1194	Disagree		
1195	Agree		
1196	Agree		
1197	Disagree		
1198	Neutral		
1199	Disagree		
1200	Agree		
1201	Neutral		
1202	Neutral		
1203	Neutral		
1204	Neutral		
1205	Neutral		
1206	Disagree		
1207	Disagree		<p>This is incredibly unfair to the children that live in the current catchment area. Bringing kids in from further away is very environmentally unfriendly, as is making the local kids from non-feeder schools travel to schools further away. Also it creates an unfair tier system, everyone else works with a catchment area system while your trust looks after only its own. Not setting a terribly good example is it?</p>
1208	Disagree		
1209	Disagree		
1210	Agree		
1211	Disagree		
1212	Neutral		
1213	Neutral		
1214	Neutral		
1215	Not Applicable		
1216	Neutral		
1217	Neutral		
1218	Neutral		
1219	Disagree		<p>We oppose the consultation from Oaklodge primary school. We want access to local schools. We are interested in Langley park school for boys. It is an excellent school and should be available for local children.</p> <p>We oppose the consultation.</p>
1220	Neutral		
1221	Neutral		
1222	Disagree		<p>Just because a member of staff has a child of school age it I see not a good reason to be given priority for a school place. Many teachers arrange before and after school care for their children, so the LPLT staff should be the same. Also not all staff live in the catchment area, so that means their children won't be at a local school with local friends, which is actually detrimental to them.</p>
1223	Disagree		
1224	Neutral		
1225	Neutral		
1226	Disagree		

1227	Disagree		I would suggest this only applies if there are special needs that justify the child needing to be in the same location as the parent. Otherwise a local child may have to travel further afield for a school place and this does not seem to be justified. A teacher could move to the area to guarantee access.
1228	Disagree		
1229	Disagree		
1230	Disagree		I don't think there is any purpose of granting priority to staff employed at the primary schools in question especially if they don't live in the local areas of the secondary schools in question
1231	Disagree		
1232	Agree		
1233	Agree		
1234	Neutral		
1235	Disagree		Children that live in the area should have priority over children of staff. Our children should have the right to be able to walk to school or not travel too far.
1236	Neutral		
1237	Neutral		
1238	Agree		If it discourages good staff to leave as they have to juggle work arrangements then they should give priority.
1239	Neutral		
1240	Neutral		
1241	Disagree		
1242	Disagree		My children have left education but it is still a concern to me, as it will affect travel, pollution of the environment because children unable to get into their nearest schools will have to travel further and this is usually by car or bus. The risk of safety to these children and the impact of friendship groups and well-being. I am a firm believer of local schools for local children.
1243	Neutral		
1244	Disagree		
1245	Disagree		Children of teachers do better when not at the same school as their parents.
1246	Disagree		
1247	Disagree		
1248	Disagree		
1249	Disagree		
1250	Disagree		
1251	Agree		
1252	Agree		
1253	Disagree		
1254	Disagree		
1255	Neutral		
1256	Disagree		
1257	Disagree		This will limit numbers for local children.
1258	Agree		
1259	Agree		
1260	Disagree		
1261	Agree		
1262	Neutral		
1263	Disagree		I think this would add to school related traffic as staff do not necessarily live close to the Langley schools. It further reduces the available spaces for children who may be geographically closer forcing them to travel across the borough rather than attending their closest school.
1264	Agree		
1265	Disagree		
1266	Agree		If I were to retrain as a teacher, I would choose to work in a school where both of my children (boy and girl) could benefit. This proposal will help both schools recruit and retain better quality staff, and will be fair on their families and better for the environment as they will all be able to travel together.
1267	Agree		
1268	Neutral		
1269	Agree		

1270	Disagree		
1271	Disagree		On the basis that I disagree with the introduction of feeder schools, there is no significant reason why children of staff members at the primary schools within the trust should have priority admission into the secondary schools. The consultation document essentially describes this plan as an incentive to attract good staff across the trust. There are alternative and more appropriate incentives which do not disrupt the school population.
1272	Agree		
1273	Agree		
1274	Disagree		
1275	Agree		
1276	Disagree		
1277	Disagree		only if they live local should they go to the school.
1278	Neutral		
1279	Disagree		Admitting children on criteria other than distance disadvantages local children. Children who miss out on Langley secondary schools because of proposed criteria catchment will take places of other Beckenham secondary schools, which will result in the catchment areas of these schools becoming smaller.
1280	Neutral		I appreciate this is a useful incentive for attracting and retaining staff but as I don't know the numbers involved its unclear on the impact on other children.
1281	Disagree		It is totally irrelevant as the member of staff don't work for either of the high schools.
1282	Disagree		
1283	Not Applicable		
1284	Not Applicable		
1285	Disagree		
1286	Disagree		Local Children first.
1287	Disagree		
1288	Disagree		
1289	Agree		They work there so make the staff lives easier. Teachers have it hard enough already.
1290	Disagree		
1291	Agree		
1292	Disagree		
1293	Disagree		Children of staff members do not necessarily live in the area and therefore are taking places away from more local children.
1294	Agree		
1295	Agree		
1296	Disagree		
1297	Disagree		
1298	Disagree		
1299	Disagree		
1300	Disagree		
1301	Disagree		
1302	Agree		
1303	Neutral		
1304	Disagree		
1305	Disagree		
1306	Disagree		
1307	Neutral		
1308	Disagree		Should be for local roads only
1309	Disagree		
1310	No Response		
1311	Neutral		The proposal gives no detail regarding the level of children that this would be. Assuming that the number per year group is relatively low, I don't object to this change in admissions policy.
1312	Disagree		Staff often travel substantial distances to teach in the primary school, often by driving. Children would have to travel a further distance to get to the secondary schools therefore adding more traffic to an already heavily trafficked area. It is not a fair decision to allow these children to have priority over local children who can walk to school
1313	Disagree		
1314	Agree		
1315	Disagree		

1316	Not Applicable		
1317	Agree		
1318	Agree		
1319	Disagree		
1320	Disagree		
1321	Disagree		Takes places for local school children. Teachers at other primary schools do not have this option.
1322	Not Applicable		
1323	Disagree		
1324	Disagree		
1325	Neutral		
1326	Disagree		
1327	Disagree		
1328	Neutral		
1329	Disagree		
1330	Disagree		
1331	Disagree		
1332	Agree		
1333	Agree		
1334	Neutral		
1335	Agree		
1336	Agree		
1337	Agree		
1338	Neutral		
1339	Agree		
1340	Neutral		
1341	Agree		
1342	Agree		
1343	Agree		Excellent idea and very important in order to support teachers and their families.
1344	Disagree		Children unfairly given priority over students that live close to the school.
1345	Not Applicable		
1346	Neutral		
1347	Agree		
1348	Disagree		
1349	Disagree		The people who made the proposal wanted to take advantages of being part of the same trust and take public benefits from other people. Park Langley secondary schools are state schools funded by British tax payers and they are not funded just by the trust. Local families should have an equal chance to get a place for their children, based on the distance from their house. _x000D_ _x000D_ We are a local family with two hard working parents and we moved here (near Park Langley school for boys) in 2018, so that we hope our boys can go to the school in a few years time. They are currently in Pickhurst Infants school. We have been VERY angry with the people with their proposal since it was released in December, as we (us and LOTS of other families in Pickhurst School) would be massively affected by the new criteria. This is utterly ridiculous!!! We would ask the people who proposed the new school's admission arrangements to withdraw them!!
1350	Neutral		
1351	Disagree		
1352	Neutral		
1353	Agree		
1354	Neutral		I believe it is important for the MAT, as with any school, to make a viable offer to staff at each of their schools and that if offering their children a school place assists with that, then it should be open to the MAT to do so.
1355	Disagree		
1356	Disagree		
1357	Neutral		
1358	Disagree		
1359	Not Applicable		

1360	Neutral		I possibly understand this for primary schools due to the travel aspect and time but not for secondary as students travel independently from their parents.
1361	Disagree		That's unfair as its a primary school.
1362	Agree		
1363	Not Applicable		
1364	Neutral		Why is there a need for a parent to work at the same school as their child aged 11+. What benefits?
1365	Disagree		
1366	Neutral		
1367	Disagree		I would agree with Langley primary which is on site to the secondary schools. This has an obvious benefit regarding helping the staff with transport, child care etc. I can see no benefit for the other primary schools. Teachers who are not local to the area will be filling spaces with no local children simply for the reason they can. This is not a policy that is common across the UK and would set a precedent for all to potentially follow.
1368	Disagree		allocation should be as normal LBB criteria eg proximity to school
1369	Neutral		
1370	Disagree		
1371	Not Applicable		
1372	Disagree		
1373	Neutral		
1374	Agree		
1375	Neutral		
1376	Agree		Seems sensible for staff retention
1377	Disagree		It should be in the catchment area.
1378	Neutral		
1379	Disagree		This change will be detrimental to families living in the area, as it would mean increased commute times for local children and for some, having to rely on car travel to other schools, which increases pollution, road congestion and the chance of accidents occurring. _x000D_ Schools should take in local children to help minimise traffic and pollution caused by out of area children being driven in. _x000D_ In addition, if you have a policy of taking in children from feeder schools, it means that children will come from a wider area, which means they would find it harder to socialise out of school due to the distances involved in travelling. My children have built up really solid friendships with other children at Unicorn Primary school who only live a few streets away. Had these children lived further away, then these bonds would not be as strong.
1380	Not Applicable		
1381	Agree		
1382	Agree		
1383	Agree		
1384	Agree		
1385	Disagree		
1386	Neutral		
1387	Neutral		
1388	Disagree		if the children are not resident in the area why should they take priority over those that are
1389	Disagree		
1390	Neutral		
1391	Neutral		
1392	Disagree		
1393	Agree		
1394	Neutral		
1395	Agree		
1396	Disagree		
1397	Not Applicable		
1398	Neutral		
1399	Agree		
1400	Neutral		
1401	Disagree		
1402	Neutral		I don't mind teachers getting priority as long as it isn't to the detriment of local children

1403	Disagree		Completely inappropriate, unfair to children who live in the locality. secondary school staff do not need to access the school in which they teach to promote the retention of quality staff - the environment of the school, the quality of the support and skills development to teachers are far more important. Same for primary staff - especially for access to schools they are not near, they don't need to accompany their children to school and children would be best placed travelling short distances to school._x000D_ _x000D_ Options A & B are both terrible. T_x000D_ There is no reason why children (who have a teacher parent as opposed to a bus driver parent, or nurse or stockbroker, or unemployed) should be singled out for special access. State education should be delivered to all equally and fairly. If this is a perk they want they can apply for a job in one of the many private schools in Bromley where they can pay for their child's education at a reduced rate.
1404	Disagree		
1405	Disagree		
1406	Disagree		
1407	Neutral		I support this as a way to support recruitment and retention of staff. However, I think it should be more closely linked to types of staff where there are recruitment and retention challenges. I.e. is the challenge the same for teaching staff, teaching assistants, admin staff, other support staff?
1408	Disagree		
1409	Neutral		
1410	Neutral		
1411	Agree		
1412	Disagree		
1413	Disagree		This is an unfair disadvantage to local residents and their children. Like many other residents, we specifically chose West Wickham as our choice of residences (13 years ago), with schools in mind for their children. How can it be deemed slightly fair that staff and their children who potentially reside some distance away from the Langley schools secure a place within their desired school without any factor of proximity in place. _x000D_ _x000D_ The affect this would have on pollution due to extra traffic congestion into the area would almost certainly have a negative impact. _x000D_ _x000D_ Local children should be able to walk to their nearest school, not be forced to take a different form of transport purely because they cannot secure a place for your proposed reasons.
1414	Neutral		
1415	Disagree		
1416	Agree		Believe it provides staff with an added benefit to attract the best teachers/staff and hopefully will aid with the retention of staff. Also feel it may be easier for staff having their children educated within the trust schools.
1417	Disagree		
1418	Agree		Clare House - With the complexity of family life, I agree that children of staff should be given priority to attend the school.
1419	Agree		
1420	Disagree		As I consider that this proposal would make it less likely that parents from our school would be able to secure a place at Langley Park Boys or Girls Secondary Schools, and would object for this reason.
1421	Agree		this seems reasonable at the school in which they work ONLY. better for the climate and would work well for that particular parent and child.
1422	Agree		
1423	Disagree		
1424	Disagree		
1425	Disagree		
1426	Agree		This may help retain staff with young children
1427	Neutral		
1428	Disagree		I believe that staff at other schools should be treated in line with others in the local community. The only connection to Langley Park School for Boys or School for girls will be their employment in a school which is at the edge of the catchment for LPSB or LPSG. They should rely on proximity in the first instance and then siblings in the second.
1429	Disagree		
1430	Disagree		Staff come and go and it may also encourage people to take jobs at schools just to get their children a place there, unfairly then taking places away from local children.
1431	Neutral		
1432	Disagree		
1433	Agree		
1434	Disagree		School places should go to local children not to children of teachers that do not work at the school.

1435	Neutral		
1436	Agree		
1437	Disagree		
1438	Agree		
1439	Disagree		
1440	Neutral		
1441	Disagree		
1442	Agree		
1443	No Response		
1444	Disagree		
1445	Agree		
1446	Neutral		
1447	Disagree		
1448	Neutral		
1449	Disagree		
1450	Neutral		
1451	Disagree		Absolute joke. How are kids living further away being given priority to those closer to the school because they aren't in a feeder... seriously! If this is about money and not about the children it is absolutely deplorable
1452	Disagree		Staff employed at the primary schools in the schools' admission arrangements are basically employees and working parents. They should be treated as just that and no different from the parents of any other children being considered in the school's admission arrangement. If they were it would be bias and extremely unfair. There is also the risk of children of teachers being treated in a more favourable way because of their parent/s.
1453	Disagree		
1454	Agree		
1455	Disagree		
1456	Neutral		
1457	Neutral		
1458	Neutral		
1459	Agree		
1460	Disagree		
1461	Disagree		
1462	Disagree		
1463	Disagree		
1464	Agree		
1465	Disagree		
1466	Neutral		
1467	No Response		
1468	Agree		
1469	Disagree		Unfair
1470	Disagree		I do not think that priority needs to be given to children of staff attending the school over children living in the nearby area - as it can be difficult enough getting your child into the closest school due to very small catchment areas.
1471	Neutral		
1472	Neutral		
1473	Agree		
1474	Disagree		
1475	Agree		
1476	Not Applicable		
1477	Disagree		If it is teachers at schools further away than those in the catchment area it is clearly unfair. Teachers will look for jobs in those schools.
1478	Agree		
1479	Neutral		
1480	Disagree		

1481	Neutral		
1482	Neutral		
1483	Neutral		
1484	Disagree		
1485	Neutral		
1486	Disagree		Happy with current system
1487	Disagree		
1488	Disagree		
1489	Disagree		Children who live nearer to the school should be given priority
1490	Disagree		
1491	Neutral		
1492	Disagree		
1493	Neutral		
1494	Agree		
1495	Disagree		
1496	Not Applicable		
1497	Agree		
1498	Agree		
1499	Agree		
1500	Disagree		
1501	Neutral		
1502	Neutral		
1503	Not Applicable		
1504	Disagree		
1505	Agree		It may encourage the teachers to stay longer and invest a long career with the school.
1506	Disagree		Is this the norm as it now stands or a proposed change? If a change it will affect the parameters of fair access.
1507	Neutral		
1508	Disagree		
1509	Disagree		
1510	Neutral		
1511	Neutral		
1512	Agree		
1513	Disagree		These should be treated as separate schools.
1514	Disagree		
1515	Agree		
1516	Disagree		
1517	Agree		
1518	Neutral		
1519	Disagree		
1520	Disagree		They could be employed there but could live outside of the catchment area which will cause a ripple effect of another kid in the area having to move to another school in another area and taking a spot there. Not to mention the personal hassle of school drop off etc if you're not in the catchment.

1521	Disagree		I fundamentally disagree that promising school places to the children of staff members helps recruit and retain the best staff. As a senior leader in a school myself, I find it surprising that your Trust can claim that to be so. This is at best misdirection and at worst and outright lie. Let's take the case of teaching staff first. You will have no proof that you will retain the best teachers because their children attend your school. A: You are saying the best teachers have children, which is quite obviously not the case. B. Rather than recruit and retain the 'best' staff, it's more likely you will have lower quality teachers who have only joined your school for one reason - to get their own child a place. It's then likely that they will leave once their child has secured a place. If a teacher joins your school and their child receives a high school place, will their child lose that place if the teacher leaves? I think not. Therefore, how can you make the argument that you will retain teachers in this way? Surely you want the BEST staff. That's just teaching staff. Will you give priority to a P.A? A member of the office staff? If you do, how do they contribute to the learning of the children. And does this include ALL staff members at all primary schools. So, if we drill down. Someone could join Clare House Primary School (wherever that is!) as an admin assistant, and their child would have priority over mine, even though I live in the Langley Park catchment area? Outrageous. Yes, of course they're important to the running of a school but it's entirely wrong for the children of admin staff to be given priority. The fact that you do not make it clear WHICH staff will have priority suggests that it is indeed ALL staff. Might I make an assumption that you don't include the children of cleaners and grounds staff and the site managers in this criteria?
1522	No Response		My son goes to a local school named Unicorn, its playground is on the boundary of LPBS. We specifically moved into the area with our children's future schools as our main priority. My daughter is already in LPGS. The thought of my son's opportunity being taken away due to these changes is unbelievable and I totally oppose. This will add huge stress to our family and many others. I believe that my son, like the majority of children should get a chance to go to their local school which fortunately for us is a five minute walk. My children walk to school which the local council recommend for health and well being and environmental reasons. However this would not be the case if he didn't get LPBS. I can't imagine the chaos on the roads when all of a sudden many children are being dropped off as they do not live close enough to walk. The proposal is unfair and a very bad idea for so many reasons!
1523	No Response		
1524	Neutral		
1525	Neutral		
1526	Agree		
1527	Neutral		
1528	Disagree		
1529	Agree		I think it makes sense for children of primary school staff to attend the school that their parents are working in. The ages of primary school children mean that they would be unable to make their own way to and from school, and the number of staff involved would be relatively low so this would not have a big impact on local children who want to go to their local primary school.
1530	Disagree		There should be no preferential arrangements given the pressure for places at the schools. The argument about hiring and retaining staff does not stand up and is 'management speak'. If they live locally they would qualify in the same way as everyone else by proximity
1531	Disagree		
1532	Disagree		
1533	Disagree		
1534	Disagree		
1535	Not Applicable		
1536	Agree		
1537	Neutral		
1538	Neutral		
1539	Agree		Teaching is a hard and thankless task at many schools. If the teachers are putting in their hard work I think that this "perk" should be available to them should they wish to use it.
1540	Disagree		
1541	Disagree		
1542	Disagree		
1543	Disagree		
1544	Neutral		
1545	Disagree		Totally rubbish, why should they get priority? No other employer needs to look at these measures for retention so why should teachers be different. If you are not committed as a teacher, you shouldn't be in that job. Staff should send their children to feeder schools if that is the case.
1546	Neutral		
1547	Disagree		If the children go to the primary schools then the teachers would not be teaching at Langley secondary school.
1548	Disagree		
1549	Disagree		
1550	Neutral		
1551	Agree		
1552	Neutral		
1553	Neutral		
1554	Disagree		

1555	Disagree		
1556	Agree		This is a reasonable proposal, Primary school children are not able to make their own way to school so would not be opposed to this.
1557	Disagree		Giving priority to children of staff would mean, particularly in light of the size of the current catchment area for that school that these children who are not local to the area would be offered a place at the secondary school and children who live much closer would not. This is unfair and goes against equal opportunities for local children.
1558	Disagree		
1559	Agree		This question is not very clear but if it is saying that the children of staff working at a primary school will have priority for their children to attend that same primary school that is a sensible proposal which will enable the school to recruit teachers to the school who may otherwise find it difficult to work at the school because of collection elsewhere.
1560	Disagree		Giving priority to children of staff at any of the primary schools may mean children of staff are not local to the area which creates a level unfairness and inequality to those children who do live in the catchment area. This also goes against the trusts' suggestion that there are educational benefits in the primary schools being feeder schools particularly as some children of staff may currently be at a primary school well away from the primary schools in the trust and also current catchment area.
1561	Agree		
1562	Agree		Great way to ensure continuity and retention of good staff.
1563	Not Applicable		
1564	Agree		I agree that this would be a positive move towards attracting and retaining quality teaching staff at the primary schools. I do note that in the proposed criteria there is a 2 year (or more) employment criteria which I also agree with.
1565	Disagree		
1566	Disagree		
1567	Disagree		
1568	Disagree		
1569	Disagree		
1570	Disagree		I appreciate the challenge in attracting staff to schools in the trust, however in the same way that my family doesn't enjoy preferential medical treatment on the basis of my wife's long-served medical research career, I find it unreasonable to offer preferential treatment to employees on the basis of being in the same "firm", in particular where the organisation in question is publicly funded.
1571	Neutral		
1572	Neutral		
1573	Neutral		
1574	Disagree		It is important for children attending primary schools to live in the same local area. If children are local to one another, they are able to socialise with one another outside of school more easily which in turn assists them in building social relationships, which is part of their wider education. It is not appropriate to exclude local children in preference to non-local children, even if they are the child of a staff member. The justification put forward in the consultation paper (enabling recruitment and retention of high quality staff) seems to be an assumption, rather than being justified by empirical evidence. The staff at the schools seem to be of very high quality and certainly in the case of Clare House, there does not seem to be a high staff turnover.
1575	Disagree		
1576	Disagree		I think giving staff priority access to the school in which they work is fair enough, but not sure I would approve if this also gives them automatic rights to another school within the group e.g. to secondary schools via a feeder system. I feel this would negatively impact on the available places for local children and create a similar situation to my comments regarding funding below, whereby it is impossible for other primary schools without secondary schools in their MATs to compete on the same basis in attracting and retaining staff. I have therefore selected disagree because it is being proposed in the context of feeder schools.
1577	Disagree		
1578	Disagree		
1579	Agree		
1580	Neutral		
1581	Neutral		
1582	Agree		
1583	Disagree		Local children should get priority.
1584	Disagree		Local children should get priority.
1585	Neutral		
1586	Agree		
1587	Disagree		
1588	Disagree		
1589	Neutral		
1590	Agree		
1591	Agree		

1592	Disagree		
1593	Neutral		
1594	Not Applicable		
1595	Neutral		
1596	Agree		
1597	Disagree		
1598	Neutral		
1599	Not Applicable		
1600	Not Applicable		
1601	Disagree		
1602	Disagree		
1603	Agree		
1604	Disagree		
1605	Disagree		
1606	Neutral		
1607	Agree		
1608	Disagree		
1609	Disagree		I am in disagreement with this proposal as a lot of children who are very close to the school will be at a huge disadvantage and will stress on their daily routine and their parents also
1610	Neutral		
1611	Agree		
1612	Neutral		
1613	Disagree		
1614	Neutral		
1615	Disagree		What about parents who don't work in schools, why should this take priority. Or if you work in another school not included above, why should other children be at a disadvantage
1616	Neutral		
1617	Neutral		Staff working at Langley site should have their children given priority but not of staff at other sites.
1618	Disagree		
1619	Disagree		
1620	Neutral		
1621	Disagree		
1622	Agree		Aids staff recruitment and retention. Also, since children will be travelling together with their parents the policy will not contribute to extra congestion.
1623	Disagree		
1624	Disagree		as long as they meet the requirements like the other families
1625	Agree		I agree that children of staff at the primary school should be allowed to attend the same primary school as I appreciate it is difficult to find childcare for young children
1626	Agree		
1627	Disagree		
1628	Disagree		
1629	Disagree		It isn't a fair way of given every child who lives in the area a chance
1630	Disagree		
1631	Neutral		
1632	Neutral		
1633	Neutral		
1634	Disagree		We moved into this area for the good schools and we are livid at the possibility of being forced out of the catchment areas by this proposal
1635	Disagree		
1636	Disagree		
1637	Disagree		I do not think it is fair that others are given preference and that all admissions should be based on vicinity to the school, unless in the case of siblings or special requirements.
1638	Neutral		
1639	Disagree		There should be no preference given other than for siblings or special requirements. Children's admissions should be based on their vicinity of the applicant home.
1640	Disagree		Children of staff shouldn't be within the criteria; its an occupation not membership with perks.
1641	Agree		

1642	Agree		
1643	Disagree		There is no good reason for this difference in treatment. There should be one rule for all, in the interests of fairness.
1644	Neutral		
1645	Agree		
1646	Neutral		
1647	Agree		
1648	Disagree		
1649	Disagree		
1650	Neutral		
1651	Disagree		
1652	Disagree		
1653	Neutral		
1654	Disagree		I strongly disagree with the idea that children of staff working at a different school on a different geographical site should get priority over children living close to the LPLT secondary schools. There is no practical reason why this would benefit children, other than those whose parents are employed by the school. It could benefit LPLT as they may retain staff, or gain staff who wish to send their children to the LPLT schools -but a school is there to benefit children it is not designed to be a business that focusses it's work on easy recruitment and retention of staff. This change will add to the number of children traveling increased distances, increasing local congestion around Langley secondary schools, increasing local air pollution and adding to climate change.
1655	Disagree		
1656	Disagree		
1657	Disagree		
1658	Disagree		
1659	Disagree		
1660	Disagree		This is understandable for staff at Langley Primary School which is on the same site as the Langley secondary schools. It does not make sense for this to apply to the other primary schools in the Trust, however.
1661	Disagree		
1662	Neutral		
1663	Agree		
1664	Neutral		
1665	Disagree		If these staff are travelling in from a far then it is unfair for local children to lose places to them. I appreciate life is hard for teachers with children, bur it hard for all us working parents and we don't get priorities with our jobs. We make it work.
1666	Neutral		If the child lives within the predetermined catchment area for the school, then yes. If not, then no.
1667	Agree		
1668	Disagree		
1669	Disagree		
1670	Disagree		
1671	Neutral		
1672	Agree		
1673	Neutral		
1674	Disagree		Children of teachers should get priority if they are primarily resident with the teacher. Priority should not be given to children who are not resident with the teacher.
1675	Not Applicable		
1676	Disagree		
1677	Disagree		I believe it is fundamentally unfair to discriminate against certain parents based on what job they do - to give preferential treatment to teacher's children falls into this category. Good teachers will be attracted to schools with a good ethos and where they can feel valued.
1678	Agree		
1679	Disagree		There is no certainty that these children reside within the LBB. As such they should not be afforded this accommodation.
1680	Neutral		
1681	Neutral		
1682	Disagree		Children staff of either the secondary schools would be fine in my opinion. Children of staff of the primary schools could effect the quality and reasons of staff applying to these schools as this covers a wider net.
1683	Disagree		

1684	Neutral		
1685	Neutral		
1686	Disagree		
1687	Disagree		Do not believe this is required as an incentive to recruit staff to these schools.
1688	Neutral		I agree to children of staff in the same school as their parent getting priority, but not children of staff at a different school within the trust.
1689	Disagree		If feeder status were to proceed, could mathemstically /potentially lose 40% of places. Add primary school teachers' children and this would increase even further.
1690	Neutral		This is quite often part of admissions criteria to aid recruitment and retention for many primary schools currently. However, for this proposal there is no indication given of potential figures so the impact is of this is not known.
1691	Disagree		
1692	Neutral		
1693	Disagree		
1694	Neutral		
1695	Neutral		
1696	Agree		
1697	Neutral		
1698	Disagree		
1699	Neutral		
1700	Neutral		I can only see the benefit with regards to children of staff of Langley Park Primary School as they will already be 'on-site' so to speak
1701	Disagree		
1702	Neutral		
1703	Disagree		This could give priority to children living a long way from the schools, but with parents at the school. Teachers at other local primaries do not get this benefit, so it creates unfair competition between primary schools.
1704	Agree		
1705	Disagree		The priority should be local schools for local children
1706	Agree		
1707	Disagree		
1708	Disagree		
1709	Agree		
1710	Neutral		
1711	Agree		
1712	Disagree		Priority In my opinion should be given to children of staff of Langley secondary schools only.
1713	Disagree		
1714	Neutral		
1715	Agree		
1716	Disagree		
1717	Disagree		
1718	Disagree		Would be unfair on those residents who have paid a premium to be in a good residential area with corresponding good schools. Also teacher's may only be employed at the school for a short time while their children enter the high school and then may move on, disadvantaging those that live in the area permanently and contribute to its wellbeing.
1719	Disagree		
1720	Agree		Expected to be a small impact and teachers have a tough enough job
1721	Neutral		
1722	Neutral		
1723	Disagree		I don't see any advantage that children of staff that work in schools should attend the same school. It appears to be a conflict of interest and I would suspect causes anxiety to the child and arrested development encouraging this as an admissions policy, I believe it is outdated and should disappear from ALL admissions criteria for schools.
1724	Disagree		
1725	Disagree		This still potentially negatively impacts children who are currently at other primary schools outside of the Trust but who live in closer proximity to LPGS and LPBS. What happens if the Trust add further primary schools to the group?
1726	Agree		
1727	Neutral		
1728	Disagree		

1729	Agree		
1730	Disagree		I think the current over-subscription criteria best meet the needs of the local area, which should be prioritised above the desires of LPLT.
1731	Disagree		
1732	Disagree		It's not fair on local children
1733	Agree		
1734	Agree		
1735	Disagree		
1736	Disagree		Children benefit from attending a school that is local to where they live and where their friends live. Therefore a child who's only real connection to the school is the parent as a teacher I think is unhealthy and detrimental to their education. _x000D_ A family or child and their carer's needs (convenience in getting a child or siblings to school on time and them getting to work as well as providing a healthy start to the day) far out-way the convenience given to a teacher in arriving to work. I disagree that this should be an employee 'benefit' or that it helps in retaining staff. _x000D_ The retention of staff is based on the management of the school, their job satisfaction, progression and salary - not benefits.
1737	Agree		
1738	Neutral		
1739	Agree		
1740	Disagree		
1741	Agree		
1742	Agree		
1743	Disagree		
1744	Not Applicable		
1745	Neutral		
1746	Disagree		
1747	Disagree		
1748	Not Applicable		
1749	Disagree		
1750	Disagree		Giving priority to children of staff across all schools will impact detrimentally on local children who will struggle to then gain a place at their local school.
1751	Agree		
1752	Agree		
1753	Agree		
1754	Disagree		
1755	Agree		
1756	Disagree		Unfair to local children
1757	Disagree		No thank you.
1758	Disagree		
1759	Agree		
1760	Disagree		
1761	Agree		
1762	Agree		
1763	Disagree		It makes no sense whatsoever to give priority to children of staff at the named primary schools in the admission process. It almost looks like trying to admit some students with really weak link to the secondary schools for the sole purpose of stopping other deserving students.
1764	Neutral		
1765	Disagree		
1766	Disagree		I disagree with this proposal. If children of teachers from five schools gain automatic access, this will significantly decrease the number of places left for local children and reduce catchment areas, with significant negative effects on the local community.
1767	Agree		
1768	Disagree		
1769	Disagree		
1770	Not Applicable		
1771	Not Applicable		
1772	Agree		This is a reasonable step to promote staff retention, attract new recruits.

1773	Disagree		Although this proposal may support efforts to recruit and retain staff, priority should not be given to residents outside the Langley area at the cost of local residents/parents who wish to have their children attend Langley Boy/Girls.
1774	Neutral		
1775	Neutral		
1776	Neutral		
1777	Agree		
1778	Agree		
1779	Disagree		
1780	Neutral		The inclusion of children of staff within the admission criteria appears to be a reasonable and well-established practice, whereby the children of staff at that particular school have priority, and one which has the potential to attract and retain staff. However, an indication of likely numbers involved would be helpful, on which to base a more informed viewpoint.
1781	Agree		
1782	Neutral		
1783	Neutral		
1784	Disagree		
1785	Disagree		
1786	Agree		
1787	Agree		
1788	No Response		
1789	Disagree		
1790	Disagree		
1791	Neutral		
1792	Agree		
1793	Neutral		
1794	Neutral		
1795	Disagree		
1796	Neutral		
1797	Agree		
1798	Agree		
1799	Agree		
1800	Disagree		
1801	Disagree		
1802	Disagree		
1803	Disagree		
1804	Agree		
1805	Disagree		
1806	Disagree		I do not believe children should be taught in an environment where their parent works as it can cause problems for both parties. Also, this is difficult to manage. Teachers of children at primary age more often than not work part time so does this mean their child gets a place or is it just for full time members of staff? What about teaching assistants, office staff etc. How long is a piece of string....it would be a minefield! Also if the teacher left, would the child need to leave too? A huge unnecessary undertaking should this go ahead.
1807	Neutral		
1808	Disagree		
1809	Not Applicable		
1810	Disagree		It does not make sense for primary schools staff to be given priority over distance. There may be closer secondary schools nearer to the primary school staff home. I think an exception can be made for staff in Langley Park primary as it's next to the secondaries.
1811	Neutral		
1812	Not Applicable		
1813	Disagree		It is grossly unfair for a catchment area school to give priority to children who may well live far outside of the catchment area (eg children of Clare house staff). It is also unfair on children attending the other primary schools in the area - who live well within the Langley secondary school catchment areas - but whose primary schools are not part of the Trust.
1814	Disagree		This will significantly decrease the availability of places to local children.
1815	Disagree		It seems unfair to give priority to children staff of the proposed feeder schools to the disadvantage of more local children.
1816	Disagree		This discriminates against children who are not children of staff without a reasonable explanation

1817	Agree		
1818	Agree		
1819	Agree		
1820	Disagree		
1821	Agree		
1822	Disagree		
1823	Disagree		
1824	Neutral		
1825	Neutral		
1826	Disagree		
1827	Neutral		
1828	Disagree		
1829	Neutral		
1830	Disagree		
1831	Disagree		This feels completely unfair as there would be 5 schools where children gain instant access, massively restricting places for local children. In addition, these children could come from completely different boroughs which again is disadvantaging local children
1832	Disagree		
1833	Agree		
1834	Disagree		
1835	Agree		
1836	Disagree		Two of the three primary schools are geographically distant from the secondary schools and it makes no sense to prioritise either children from those schools or children of the staff at those schools. This objection does not apply to Langley Park Primary School.
1837	Neutral		
1838	Neutral		The proposals are for primary schools with much lower PANs than secondary schools and will have a magnified effect on the shrinkage catchment area of the school. I'm not against this proposal completely but would suggest limit only to certain circumstances, e.g. been at the school at least a number of years or filling a demonstrable skill shortage and minimum hours per week.
1839	Disagree		Completely disagree. This is unfair on access for local children at a time when secondary school places are in short supply.
1840	Neutral		
1841	Agree		
1842	Disagree		
1843	Neutral		
1844	Disagree		
1845	Agree		
1846	Disagree		With children of teachers from five schools gaining automatic access, this will significantly decrease the availability of places available to the rest of the community and shrink the "catchment" areas, with significant negative effects on the community.
1847	Disagree		
1848	Disagree		
1849	Disagree		
1850	Agree		
1851	Neutral		
1852	Disagree		With children of teachers from five schools gaining automatic access, this will significantly decrease the availability of places available to the rest of the community and shrink the "catchment" areas, with significant negative effects on the community.
1853	Disagree		
1854	Neutral		
1855	Agree		
1856	Neutral		
1857	Agree		I support the proposed changes, giving priority to children of staff, providing that staff members are permanent employees and serve a minimum term of employment and suggest two years prior to application. This would stop staff members working at the schools for temporary period, securing a place for their child and then resigning.
1858	Agree		

1859	Disagree		It will shrink the catchment area and it more pressure on the parents and children
1860	Disagree		
1861	Disagree		
1862	Disagree		If more places are taken by children of staff at the primary schools (so not even on same site) then this will decrease the availability of places available to children in the local community (who may also live closer). This could potentially shrink the catchment areas for the secondary schools and have a significant negative impact on the community. The point of giving places to children of staff at the school that they work at is reasonable as they would both be travelling to the same destination, but across the different schools isn't reasonable and the arguments do not justify this change.
1863	Disagree		This would, with the children of staff employed at the five schools in total having priority in the application criteria, likely result in a noticeably reduced number of Langley secondary Year 7 places for children who otherwise were likely to be offered a place based on their home proximity to the schools.
1864	Agree		
1865	Agree		
1866	Disagree		
1867	Disagree		Adverse impact on the ability of children who would normally live within a reasonable catchment area of the school to be able to attend their local secondary due to a reduction of spaces available as a result of an increased staff base having access to send their children to the school should they so wish.
1868	Disagree		
1869	Disagree		
1870	Neutral		
1871	Neutral		
1872	Neutral		
1873	Disagree		
1874	Disagree		You have not provided enough information in your consultation document to enable people to assess the impact this would have on admissions - for example, how many staff and their children might qualify.
1875	Neutral		
1876	Not Applicable		
1877	Disagree		
1878	Disagree		This would significantly decrease the availability of places available to the rest of the Community and have negative effects on the Community.
1879	Disagree		With the action put it place it would mean little numbers left on the admissions.
1880	Agree		Makes sense. How inconvenient would it be if you had to take your kids to a different school than where you work.
1881	Disagree		
1882	Disagree		
1883	Disagree		
1884	Disagree		
1885	Disagree		
1886	Agree		I consider it would be fair to give children of teaching and managerial staff priority although I do not consider this should be extended to admin, cleaning, kitchen staff etc. My reason is that people may take advantage and seek easy to come by job to get children in then leave.
1887	Disagree		
1888	Neutral		
1889	Agree		
1890	Neutral		
1891	Disagree		This gives priority to a potentially huge number of children - I do not see any indication of the numbers of staff or children involved or the impact on admissions for those currently admitted by virtue of geography - a serious defect in the consultation process. Given that the catchment area for staff is probably quite large, the children so advantaged could be coming from great distances, which is seriously at odds with the interests of the locality that the Langley secondary schools are supposed to serve. Also what would happen if the Trust were to enlarge to cover even more remote primary schools? Notwithstanding the statement that this would be considered on a case by case basis, this would set an extremely damaging precedent.
1892	Disagree		
1893	Disagree		
1894	Disagree		
1895	Disagree		With staff of only one school allowed priority entry, there is a minimal impact on admission places. Opening this to more schools increases the impact. It cannot be argued on ease of transportation because the schools are not all geographically close.
1896	Disagree		It would put the children in the local vicinity at a disadvantage. Plus children benefit from going to school with children in their local area and this applies to staff children as it does to everyone. Giving staff priority would disadvantage local children by having less places available to them, plus their own children would be better placed in their own local schools.

1897	Disagree		
1898	Neutral		
1899	Neutral		
1900	Disagree		This is wrong. Schools should choose and support from their_x000D_ local catchment areas where walking to your local school should be the norm which also equals less CO2 from Cars
1901	Agree		
1902	Neutral		
1903	Disagree		
1904	Disagree		
1905	Neutral		
1906	Disagree		This proposal reduces the options for schooling even further down for many children to select pupils.
1907	Disagree		Strongly disagree: this will reduce places and I can't see a valid reason why Children of Primary School staff should be prioritised.
1908	Disagree		
1909	Agree		
1910	Neutral		
1911	Neutral		
1912	Disagree		
1913	Agree		
1914	Neutral		
1915	Disagree		With children of teachers from five schools gaining automatic access, this will significantly decrease the availability of places available to the rest of the community and shrink the ‘catchment’ areas, with significant negative effects on the community.
1916	Disagree		
1917	Disagree		If priority is given to children of staff at the three primary schools this will reduce the number of places available to others and thereby the catchment area will also become smaller. This proposal doesn't even take into account the number of children of staff at any of the five schools.
1918	Disagree		
1919	Disagree		it will reduce the catchment area of local secondary schools and effect the chances of my children attend a langley park secondary school or other secondary school nearby.
1920	Agree		
1921	Neutral		
1922	Disagree		Children of staff from 5 primary schools in the area gaining automatic access will significantly decrease the number of places available to the rest of the community and shrink the proximity criteria. I think this will adversely affect the local community.
1923	Disagree		Children of staff from 5 primary schools in the area gaining automatic access will significantly decrease the number of places available to the rest of the community and shrink the proximity criteria. I think this will adversely affect the local community.
1924	Disagree		Why should other kids that live closer miss out just because their parents are not teachers at the named primary schools?
1925	Disagree		
1926	Neutral		
1927	Agree		Yes I agree for primary schools because of logistics in travelling to school but I don’t think it is essential for secondary education.
1928	Disagree		Totally unfair policy
1929	Agree		
1930	Agree		
1931	Neutral		
1932	Agree		
1933	Disagree		
1934	Disagree		With children of teachers from five schools gaining automatic access, this will_x000D_ significantly decrease the availability of places available to the rest of the community and_x000D_ shrink the ‘catchment’ areas, with significant negative effects on the community.
1935	Neutral		
1936	Neutral		
1937	Neutral		
1938	Agree		
1939	Agree		

1940	Agree		reasonable (covers child care issues)
1941	Disagree		
1942	Neutral		
1943	Disagree		If children from all of the primary schools were given automatic access then this with significantly decrease the amount of spaces available to local children.
1944	Disagree		
1945	Agree		
1946	Neutral		
1947	Neutral		
1948	Neutral		I understand the need to recruit and retain good teachers.
1949	Disagree		This would give an unfair advantage to large number of children who might not even live near LP schools! This would shrink the catchment area dramatically and leave children who actually live near LP schools unable to attend the schools.
1950	Disagree		If children of teachers from the five schools in the trust are given priority, this will significantly decrease the availability of places available to the rest of the community and shrink the ‘catchment’ areas, therefore having a negative effects on the community.
1951	Disagree		See below
1952	Disagree		
1953	Agree		
1954	Disagree		
1955	Disagree		
1956	Disagree		
1957	Agree		
1958	Agree		I think these are sensible amendments to the admissions arrangements.
1959	Disagree		
1960	Disagree		
1961	Disagree		
1962	Agree		
1963	Agree		
1964	Neutral		
1965	Disagree		Catchment area will shrink, with fewer places available to the local community.
1966	Disagree		
1967	Disagree		
1968	Disagree		
1969	Disagree		With children of teachers from all the schools gaining priority access, this will significantly decrease the availability of places available to the rest of the community and shrink the ‘catchment’ areas, with significant negative effects on the community.
1970	Disagree		
1971	Neutral		
1972	Disagree		If children of teachers from the five schools in the trust are given priority, this will significantly decrease the availability of places available to the rest of the community and shrink the ‘catchment’ areas, therefore having a negative effects on the community.
1973	Neutral		
1974	Agree		
1975	Disagree		
1976	Neutral		
1977	Agree		
1978	Agree		
1979	Disagree		
1980	Agree		I support the admission of staff children at the school where they work, and understand this as a recruitment tool which can have a positive impact on staff commitment.
1981	Neutral		
1982	Disagree		Children of teachers from 5 schools to gain access across all schools is unreasonable. It is unquantifiable and would lead to the decrease of availability of spaces for other more local children.
1983	Disagree		They too should be within the applicable catchment, not because the parent happens to be staff at the school.
1984	Disagree		This would reduce the amount of places available for local children which seems unfair.
1985	Disagree		

1986	Neutral		
1987	Disagree		The teachers are not the only Pubic servants in the area - as a pubic servant I suffer the same issues regarding housing costs/prices that have formed in the area around Langley schools. if this was allowed then same criteria should be for other public services especially children of emergency service personnel.
1988	Neutral		
1989	Disagree		A teacher could live miles away from the catchment, therefore staff children would take away valuable places for local children.
1990	Neutral		
1991	Disagree		This would be taking away a place from a local child.
1992	Neutral		
1993	Agree		
1994	Disagree		
1995	Neutral		
1996	Disagree		
1997	Disagree		
1998	Neutral		
1999	Disagree		
2000	Agree		
2001	Neutral		
2002	Neutral		
2003	Disagree		
2004	Disagree		
2005	Disagree		
2006	Disagree		
2007	Disagree		
2008	Disagree		
2009	Disagree		
2010	Disagree		
2011	Disagree		
2012	No Response		
2013	Disagree		
2014	Disagree		
2015	Disagree		
2016	No Response		
2017	Disagree		
2018	Agree		
2019	Neutral		
2020	Not Applicable		
2021	Neutral		
2022	Neutral		
2023	Neutral		
2024	Disagree		
2025	Disagree		Staff from five different schools accros the trust being automatically allocated a place for their children will significantly decess the availability of places to the rest of the community. This will make the catchment much small having a negative effect on local children who attend local schools.
2026	Neutral		
2027	Disagree		
2028	Disagree		
2029	Disagree		I can't agree within the context of the proposed changes. The temptation to obtain short term employment to occupy a place in school and afterwards leave the school or move away from the community creates an unfair admission situation from infant to senior school for the initial child and all siblings.
2030	Neutral		
2031	Agree		
2032	Neutral		

2033	Agree		
2034	Agree		
2035	Agree		
2036	Disagree		
2037	Neutral		
2038	Neutral		
2039	Disagree		
2040	Disagree		
2041	Neutral		
2042	Neutral		
2043	Disagree		
2044	Disagree		Strongly disagree with this, it will significantly reduce the places available for local children.
2045	Neutral		
2046	Disagree		
2047	Disagree		
2048	Disagree		
2049	Neutral		
2050	Disagree		
2051	Disagree		
2052	Neutral		
2053	Neutral		
2054	Disagree		
2055	Disagree		
2056	Disagree		Entrance to the Langley Secondary schools should be based on distance alone as is currently the situation.
2057	No Response		
2058	Neutral		
2059	Disagree		
2060	Neutral		
2061	Disagree		
2062	Neutral		
2063	Disagree		To give priority to children of staff at all 5 trusts would mean a large number of places would be taken from those that would normally be offered places by proximity. This would have detrimental effects on the community as the catchment areas would be much smaller.
2064	Disagree		
2065	Neutral		
2066	Disagree		
2067	Disagree		Whilst I can see the benefit of giving priority to children of staff teaching at the specific secondary school (childcare benefits, transport benefit etc), there are no compelling arguments that support giving priority to the children of teachers at other schools in the Trust. There are alternative ways to attract good quality staff that do not involve reducing the number of spaces available to local children - competitive salaries for example. I would hope the school would want to recruit staff that buy in to their ethos rather than simply to get their child into a school that they would otherwise not have access to.
2068	Neutral		
2069	Disagree		
2070	Neutral		
2071	Neutral		
2072	Neutral		
2073	Neutral		
2074	Neutral		
2075	Disagree		
2076	Disagree		This will reduce spaces for local children which will be unfair for Langley boys and Langley girls
2077	Neutral		
2078	Disagree		

2079	Disagree		If the children of teachers at the primary schools are given preference at these schools it is most likely that they will later move to LPSB or LPSG thereby further reducing the places available to the local community.
2080	Neutral		
2081	Agree		
2082	Neutral		
2083	Agree		This may retain staff and helps parents with their daily logistics if they are teachers.
2084	Disagree		It is not fair or reasonable to give priority to children of staff at the primary schools as they are not necessarily going to live locally and therefore it will negatively impact local children.
2085	Disagree		
2086	Disagree		This would disadvantage local children by reducing the catchment area, meaning more local children would have to travel further to a secondary school. I can not see how this would help the parents with logistics etc as 2 of the proposed feeder schools are some distance from the secondary school.
2087	Neutral		
2088	Disagree		Should not have priority over existing pupils of trust schools as many staff live outside current admissions area and would be unfair to those children of who do live in the admissions area.
2089	Disagree		
2090	Neutral		
2091	Disagree		If the children of teachers at the primary schools are given preference at these schools it is most likely that they will later move to LPSB or LPSG thereby further reducing the places available to the local community.
2092	Agree		
2093	Disagree		
2094	Neutral		
2095	Neutral		
2096	Disagree		Although probably a low number of places; this will still decrease the availability to local children. Surely their children should be attending the schools where they live.
2097	Disagree		
2098	Disagree		
2099	Agree		I think that it is an important and effective way of recruiting good teachers who will stay with the school long term
2100	Neutral		
2101	Disagree		There are 5 schools currently in the Trust. With priority of places being given to the children of staff employed at the schools-an i note it is 'staff' and not teachers' children-there would be a significant shortage in the numbers of spaces being offered to children who live within the community. Thus reducing the catchment areas even further.
2102	Disagree		
2103	Neutral		
2104	Disagree		There is no rational reason to allow teachers children at 5 schools to have priority over local children.
2105	Neutral		
2106	Agree		
2107	Agree		Children of staff from LPSG and LPSB and Langley Primary school should be able to have priority!! Not CLARE HOUSE as it's NOT in West Wickham area!
2108	Disagree		
2109	Disagree		
2110	Agree		
2111	No Response		
2112	Disagree		
2113	Disagree		
2114	Disagree		with the addition of the 3 primary schools, the children of the staff given priority would potentially make an impact on availability of places for local children and will shrink the 'catchment' area
2115	Disagree		I don't agree as not everyone gets the opportunity to work metres from where their child attends school, so don't see why school workers should.
2116	Disagree		
2117	Disagree		
2118	Disagree		As a working (not at a school) parent myself, I do not expect my children to be given priority to any school near my place of work. The same should apply to the children of teachers in a school. Admission criteria in a state school should be fair and equal for everybody, regardless of where their parents work.
2119	Neutral		
2120	Disagree		It is fair and common practice for children of teachers at a school to be given access to the school a parent works for but not another school. There can be no reasonable benefit to anyone allowing this. It doesn't help with taking kids to school and deprives a place for another eligible child.
2121	Neutral		

2122	Disagree		
2123	Disagree		
2124	Not Applicable		
2125	Agree		
2126	Disagree		With children of teachers from five schools gaining automatic access, this will significantly decrease the availability of places available to the rest of the community and shrink the 'catchment' areas, with significant negative effects on the community.
2127	Disagree		Parents should ideally choose a school based on the individual needs of their child, not for the convenience of where they work, especially if that disadvantages a local child. I am also uncomfortable with it being used as a recruitment tactic, as staff should work at these schools because they wish to educate children, not look after their own. It also disadvantages other local schools in more challenging contexts, who will see "better" schools scoop up the best teachers.
2128	Neutral		
2129	Agree		
2130	Neutral		
2131	Disagree		Giving priority to children of staff at the primary schools would dramatically decrease the number of places available to local children or reduce the catchment area for those schools.
2132	Agree		
2133	Agree		
2134	Disagree		
2135	Disagree		With children of teachers from 5 schools gaining automatic access, this will significantly decrease the availability of places available to the rest of the community and shrink the 'catchment' areas, with significant negative effects on the community. Therefore I don't feel anyone should be given priority and should simply be based on distance, local schools for local kids regardless of whether their parents work at the school.
2136	Disagree		I do not agree that there should be any special admission arrangements between the primary and senior schools. It has never been the policy in Bromley for there to be "feeder" schools and although I can see the benefit to schools to be able to offer staff school places at that school to encourage them to join that school, I do not see the benefit to the children attending the senior schools in tying up senior school places that would otherwise be available to local children, in order to entice staff to the primary schools, especially as this is an area where school places are in demand and Langley senior schools are always extremely oversubscribed
2137	Disagree		
2138	Agree		
2139	Neutral		Parents should choose a primary school for their child based on the merits of that school and its suitability to their individual child. A Child's primary school should ideally be in their locality, enabling them to get to and from school safely, without the need for use of a car or public transport wherever possible. I understand that family life does not always make this possible, and in certain situations it makes sense that the child attends the same school at which their parent works. Therefore my opinion is neutral.
2140	Disagree		I can see no reason why staff should be prioritised, school places should be based on catchment, i.e. living in proximity of school. _x000D_ If the 'staff' live within the catchment area then there should be the opportunity for children of staff to attend. _x000D_ With regard to the Trust's commentary regarding staff recruitment and retention, I fail to see a correlation to retention of staff and children attending the same school, conversely I would suggest children of staff should not attend the school their parents teach as there is the potential to disadvantage such pupils. _x000D_ _x000D_ I would further also query what the definition of 'staff' is, teachers, support staff, dinner ladies, cleaners etc. This should have been made abundantly clear in the question, the deliberate ambiguity could have a dramatic effect on what such a proposal could mean and impact on other children attending the school.
2141	Agree		Secondary school admissions should be based on locality.
2142	Disagree		
2143	Disagree		
2144	Agree		I think this is fair, particularly to those members of staff who have shown loyalty and worked at the school for a long time. It would also make logistics easier for people, having their children in the same school, in terms of shared holiday dates, drop off/pick ups etc.
2145	Neutral		
2146	Disagree		This is taking spaces away from local children. _x000D_ Stating it will help retain staff, what if they leave? Do their children have to leave too? _x000D_ Does the Trust not have enough Faith in itself that it can retain teachers without having to incentivise in this way???
2147	Neutral		
2148	Agree		
2149	Neutral		
2150	Disagree		
2151	Disagree		
2152	Disagree		

2153	Neutral		
2154	Disagree		
2155	Agree		I think it can only benefit a school for teachers to be able to send their own children to that school. It helps teacher retention and enables teachers to work longer hours after school as their children can attend the after school child care on site. It also only affects a small number of people and so would not alter catchment area.
2156	Disagree		more staff members' children receiving priority would reduce number of remaining available places, make catchment areas smaller and leave more children living near by without the obvious option.
2157	Neutral		
2158	Disagree		
2159	Disagree		
2160	Neutral		
2161	Agree		
2162	Disagree		With children of teachers across 5 schools gaining automatic access, this will significantly decrease the availability of places available to the rest of the community and will shrink the catchment areas, with significant negative effects on the community. This will have a knock on effect on my daughter who currently attends Oak Lodge Primary School and will absolutely effect her chances of securing a place at Langley Girls Secondary School.
2163	Disagree		Staff might not live near the schools and hence their children could travel much further than their respective local schools. I also doubt that the schedule of staff and their children always matches and travelling to and from school together seems to me the only reason wanting this change._x000D_ The proposal would give priority to children of staff members who are separated even if these children don't live with that staff member during the week. The definition of sibling includes a “must live at same address” criteria which surely must apply in the case of staff and their children too. _x000D_ Also, who qualifies as staff member? Someone who runs a 30min school club once a week?
2164	Disagree		With children of teachers from five schools gaining automatic access, this will significantly decrease the availability of places available to the rest of the community and shrink the ‘catchment’ areas, with significant negative effects on the community.
2165	Neutral		
2166	Disagree		This policy clearly discriminates against other non trust primary school children in the West Wickham area such as Pickhurst Primary school. Pickhurst Primary school will be adversely affected, with potentially fewer applications in future through no fault of their own.
2167	Disagree		Why will these children have privileged access over local children and children of other teachers in the local area that don't work for the trust. Simply wrong at all levels. Teachers should be focused on teaching and not using employment as a method to unfairly elevate their children. What's wrong with their local secondary schools?
2168	Agree		In overall agreement if the staff work at least 3 days a week.
2169	Disagree		
2170	Disagree		
2171	Neutral		
2172	Disagree		Discrimination _x000D_ Enequality
2173	Disagree		accounting for kids of all primary schools staff, would make a significant impact to places for kids who live in proximity to school
2174	Neutral		
2175	Disagree		
2176	Agree		
2177	Agree		I agree on the basis that the school run would be difficult to manage whilst fulfilling a teaching role, but I do think this should only come into effect for the duration of the primary school and the home address should then come into effect for the secondary school admissions.
2178	Neutral		
2179	Agree		
2180	Neutral		
2181	Neutral		
2182	Neutral		
2183	Disagree		
2184	Neutral		
2185	Disagree		
2186	Disagree		
2187	Disagree		Not fair to Oak Lodge and other local schools!!
2188	Neutral		
2189	Neutral		

2190	Disagree		
2191	Disagree		
2192	No Response		
2193	Neutral		
2194	Agree		I have no particular problem with children of staff at a particular primary school having priority. This should not extend across the MAT (for example, children should not be given priority admission to Hawes Down PS if their parent works at Clare House PS).
2195	Neutral		
2196	Disagree		
2197	Neutral		
2198	Neutral		
2199	Agree		
2200	Agree		
2201	Disagree		This criteria is unfair and does not fully clarify if there is a qualifying criteria (I.e. if teacher leaves the school after a term, does the child stay on and will siblings be given preference?)
2202	Agree		
2203	Neutral		
2204	Disagree		All children have a right to a good education wheher the parent is a teacher or not.
2205	Agree		
2206	Neutral		
2207	Neutral		
2208	Disagree		
2209	Agree		
2210	Disagree		
2211	Agree		This seems sensible and reasonable and helps to attract good staff who will have a keen interest in the strong performance of the school including for their own children.
2212	Agree		
2213	Disagree		
2214	Neutral		I would agree with with this except I am concerned about people seeking employment within a school and then resigning once their child has gained a place. What would happen in this instance ?
2215	Disagree		It should be a fair admission for all children otherwise children who live within proximity will be of disadvantage.
2216	Disagree		That's a lot of staff, which could grow further if more schools join the trust. You'll end up in the situation similar to church schools where people attend a church just to get their kids into to system.
2217	Disagree		
2218	Disagree		Once a child is of age to go to secondary school a level of independence from the parents should be established.
2219	Neutral		
2220	Neutral		
2221	Agree		
2222	Disagree		I enrolled my daughter in Oak Lodge Primary with the knowledge that she would be able to go to Langley. It is not fait that this can now be changed.
2223	Disagree		
2224	Neutral		
2225	Neutral		
2226	Agree		
2227	Disagree		
2228	Disagree		
2229	Neutral		
2230	Agree		I am not a teacher but if I worked in a school, I would like it if my kids could school there because it makes life a lot easier but for me as a parent of a child that is in that school, it will reduce staff turnover. More stability for my child.
2231	Disagree		
2232	Neutral		
2233	Disagree		I am very proud that my eldest daughter had an outstanding education at Langley Girls School went on to obtain a Masters degree in Maths. I am very proud that my eldest son, a gifted musician, benefitted from the amazing resources at Langley Boys School and is now training as a professional musician. My other daughter is a current pupil at Langley Girls and my youngest son, currently in year 6, has put Langley Boys as his first choice. I am very sad that if these proposals went through, it is likely that none of them would get into the Langley schools

2234	Disagree		Same rules on catchment area should apply
2235	Neutral		Whilst this proposal has an aim of recruiting and retaining quality staff at the primary schools, no evidence is provided of any significant difficulty with current recruitment/retention that requires this aim. If no particular need is clear then to introduce criterion could be to the detriment of other children on the basis of proximity. Due to the reasoning being unclear but impact hopefully small, I can only provide a neutral response.
2236	Agree		
2237	Disagree		With the staff of this many primary schools it could significantly affect the number of available places for those not within the trust.
2238	Neutral		I do not think that any of the proposed primary schools within the MAT should be a feeder school to the Langley schools. Admission to secondary schools should be based on where you live and proximity to school.
2239	Disagree		We live 5 minutes walk from Langley boys school. My son goes to Oak lodge which is also 5 minutes walk.
2240	Agree		
2241	Disagree		Disagree
2242	Disagree		
2243	Disagree		
2244	Agree		
2245	Neutral		
2246	Disagree		
2247	Not Applicable		
2248	Disagree		I can see this being perhaps useful for parent teachers in primary schools because their children require escorting to school and teachers start early. However secondary school staff with teenage children have no need as their children go to school independently and if they have primary age kids they have to get them to another school anyway. So for secondary school teachers it seems like an unfair perk that could take a place away from a local child.
2249	Neutral		
2250	Agree		
2251	Neutral		Children of staff could be allowed to go the primary school where the parent works. Must be compliant with 1.39 of the School Admissions Code.
2252	Disagree		
2253	Agree		
2254	Disagree		
2255	Not Applicable		
2256	Disagree		
2257	Neutral		
2258	Disagree		do not agree for access to any school in the Trust, but I do agree for the specific Primary School at which the parent is employed.
2259	Not Applicable		
2260	Neutral		
2261	Disagree		
2262	Disagree		
2263	Disagree		Teacher's children should be going to their local schools.
2264	Agree		
2265	Disagree		
2266	Agree		Primary school children need to be transported to school, so I agree that to this because it makes life easier for the parents who happen to be teachers at the school. Many teachers want to leave the profession, so something that makes their life easier may make them more likely to stay
2267	Disagree		
2268	Agree		
2269	Disagree		
2270	Disagree		
2271	Disagree		
2272	Agree		
2273	Neutral		
2274	Disagree		It is discriminatory
2275	Neutral		
2276	Neutral		

2277	Disagree		It is outlined that this criteria is being considered to get a better quality of staff however taking a job just to get your child into a school is completely plausible. If that member of staff chooses to leave once their child gets a place or shortly thereafter the original problem still remains
2278	Agree		
2279	Disagree		
2280	Disagree		
2281	Disagree		No details have been provided on length of duty or type of contract before being able to secure a pupil allocation._x000D_ No details have been provided on what happens if the staff member leaves their employment._x000D_ No limit has been placed on the number of pupils that can be allocated._x000D_ No definition has been provided on staff members eg is this for Teachers, Admin, Cleaners or Canteen ladies that are included within this._x000D_ Horrible wording used and therefore cannot be within the Consultation.
2282	Disagree		If people currently in Langley catchment will no longer be able to get in due to the new rules, then other schools will then have tighter catchments for the schools they are hoping to get into. It creates a no mans land where children can't get into their closest secondary school. People are forced to drive, impacting on the environment as well as schooling._x000D_ My children go to Balgowan. We have no intention of attending Langley, but these new rules will tighten the catchments for Eden Park and Harris Manor Way which May then mean we cant get into those schools.
2283	Disagree		Some teachers do not live in the borough so I find it difficult to agree with this point.
2284	Neutral		
2285	Disagree		
2286	Disagree		
2287	Disagree		No details have been provided on length of duty or type of contract before being able to secure a pupil allocation._x000D_ No details have been provided on what happens if the staff member leaves their employment._x000D_ No limit has been placed on the number of pupils that can be allocated._x000D_ No definition has been provided on staff members eg is this for Teachers, Admin, Cleaners or Canteen ladies that are included within this._x000D_ Horrible wording used and therefore cannot be within the Consultation.
2288	Agree		
2289	Agree		
2290	Disagree		
2291	Disagree		
2292	Disagree		
2293	Disagree		
2294	Not Applicable		
2295	Disagree		Other people have to make arrangements to get their children to and from school, teachers should be able to do the same for schools in their catchment areas.
2296	Neutral		
2297	Neutral		
2298	Disagree		
2299	Neutral		
2300	Agree		
2301	Disagree		
2302	Disagree		I strongly disagree with this. If children of teachers from five schools get automatic places then this will decrease the availability of places available to the rest of the community and_x000D_ make the catchment area much smaller. This will adversely affect the local community.
2303	Agree		I can appreciate while children need to be taken to school it would make life for a working parent (and their children) easier if they are going to the same place.
2304	Disagree		If there are children from the teachers of 5 schools having preference for places at the two senior schools this is likely to significantly decrease the number of places available to other local children._x000D_ Teachers may just take a job in those schools in order to guarantee a secondary placement for their child, and leave shortly after their child starting year 7, meaning that these children could be living any distance from the secondary schools but are still eligible for a place.
2305	Neutral		
2306	Disagree		No, I don't think children of staff should be given priority, as it takes away from children that live in the catchment area.
2307	Agree		
2308	Agree		
2309	Disagree		
2310	Neutral		

2311	Neutral		
2312	Neutral		
2313	Disagree		With children of teachers from the schools gaining automatic access, this will clearly cause a significant decrease in the availability of places available to the rest of the community and shrink the "catchment" areas. Something I believe will have significant negative effects on the community
2314	Disagree		This will reduce the number of places considerably if there are 5 schools with staff who get priority over local children.
2315	Neutral		
2316	Disagree		
2317	Neutral		
2318	Neutral		
2319	Disagree		
2320	Neutral		
2321	Agree		It is important to all schools to attract high quality staff and having the best teachers will benefit all pupils.
2322	Agree		This could be helpful in recruitment and retention of staff.
2323	Neutral		
2324	Disagree		
2325	Disagree		This will shrink the catchment areas due to higher number of teachers to consider with one or more children taking up spaces that local children should fill.
2326	Disagree		
2327	Agree		
2328	Disagree		Teacher might not live in local area, so unfair on people who do and also what happens if the teacher leaves? And when the child goes to a secondary school back in their own catchment area? And teachers also have different work time to the pupils school hours
2329	Not Applicable		
2330	Disagree		This proposal would mean fewer local children would have access to these schools. The extra travelling involved has implications for child safety, the environment and impact on the local communities.
2331	Neutral		
2332	Agree		
2333	Neutral		
2334	Agree		
2335	Disagree		I can see the logic behind staff in primary schools having their children in the school where they work, in view of transport, holidays etc. However, I see no reason why children of staff in feeder schools should have any priority when it comes to applications to secondary schools.
2336	Neutral		
2337	Disagree		Staff members should not be given priority just. If a school is unable to retain their staff then they should be looking at their processes and not use it as a 'perk' of the job
2338	Neutral		
2339	Neutral		
2340	Disagree		
2341	Neutral		
2342	Neutral		
2343	Neutral		
2344	Neutral		
2345	Neutral		
2346	Disagree		
2347	Disagree		
2348	Disagree		This would put local children as 6th on the priority list. x000D_ Langleigh senior schools should be for local children, not for children of staff who may live miles away
2349	Disagree		I would only agree to this proposal if the primary schools were NOT made Feeder schools for LPSB and LPSG.
2350	Disagree		
2351	Agree		
2352	Disagree		
2353	Disagree		the effect this change will have on the local community, due to the number of schools that would be accepted via this change, will be significant
2354	Neutral		Provided this does not occur across the academy (so the children of staff at one primary school are not given priority at another), I am neutral on this proposal. I disagree strongly with a 'whole academy' approach.

2355	Disagree		
2356	Disagree		With children of teachers from five schools gaining automatic access, this will significantly decrease the availability of places available to the rest of the community and shrink the ‘catchment’ areas, with significant negative effects on the community
2357	Disagree		Admission should be based on the same criteria for everyone.
2358	Agree		
2359	Disagree		I am not given priority through my work and do not think it is fair for such benefits to be made as a matter of course to teachers who may not live in the catchment. I spend many hours and much of my income working out childcare arrangements, I would expect any parent to do the same.
2360	Disagree		
2361	Disagree		
2362	Agree		
2363	Disagree		
2364	Neutral		
2365	Disagree		Whether a parent is employed by a primary school that is part of the same trust or not is irrelevant. If the reason for this is to ensure holidays are aligned then this represents preferential treatment to staff of the trust and shows absolute no regard for other working parents who have to make childcare arrangements to cover holiday periods. This is fundamentally unfair and unjust.
2366	Disagree		Unicorn is a the incumbent and natural feeder school for LPSB, the children of both Clare House and Hawes Down would need to walk an unrealistic 30-35 mins each way to reach LPSB or travel by car / public transport further contributing to excessive congestion and pollution.
2367	Agree		
2368	Disagree		No - there should be no feeder system.
2369	Agree		
2370	Disagree		
2371	Neutral		
2372	No Response		
2373	Disagree		Would agree if children of staff at Langley Park Primary School only. We recognise that there are issues for teachers' irregular hours and child care, so this may help both them and recruitment and retention.
2374	Neutral		
2375	Neutral		
2376	Neutral		
2377	Neutral		
2378	Neutral		
2379	Disagree		
2380	Agree		
2381	Disagree		Every local child should have priority
2382	Agree		
2383	Disagree		
2384	Neutral		
2385	Disagree		
2386	Neutral		
2387	Agree		
2388	Not Applicable		
2389	Disagree		
2390	Agree		
2391	Agree		
2392	Neutral		
2393	Agree		
2394	Disagree		
2395	Agree		
2396	Agree		
2397	Agree		
2398	Neutral		

2399	Disagree		
2400	Disagree		This could be a significant number of children, including many currently outside the current catchment area for the senior schools. It therefore seems a disproportionate benefit to the children of those teachers, when assessed against children who don't have a parent as a teacher at one of those schools but who live closer to the Langley schools
2401	Agree		
2402	Neutral		
2403	Disagree		A significant expansion of the number of places taken up by this group, leading to fewer places for the rest of the community. This in turn would lead to smaller 'catchments' and exclusion for more local children.
2404	Not Applicable		
2405	Disagree		
2406	Neutral		
2407	Agree		
2408	Disagree		Because it might give an unfair advantage to pupils of Clare House and Hawes Down, over Oak Lodge or closer schools.
2409	Neutral		
2410	Neutral		
2411	Disagree		I don't agree with this; it is enough to have staff at secondary schools have priority to the secondary schools. (I'm assuming that staff at each primary school already have priority to each school).
2412	Neutral		
2413	Disagree		
2414	Neutral		
2415	Neutral		
2416	Agree		
2417	Disagree		This sort of action will have a direct impact on other children by taking such action will decrease the availability of places to the rest of the community and will leave very little places for other children and may have a negative effect on the community.
2418	Disagree		
2419	Disagree		Having children of teachers from five schools gaining automatic admission will of course decrease the number of places available to local children within the current catchment area. The knock on effect will be a reduction of the catchment area and less places for local children placing unnecessary strain on the other secondary schools.
2420	Not Applicable		
2421	Disagree		Significant decrease to the places available to the rest of the community. This will inevitably reduce the size of the catchment area
2422	Disagree		
2423	Disagree		
2424	Disagree		With children of teachers from five schools gaining automatic access, this will significantly decrease the availability of places available to the rest of the community and shrink the 'catchment' areas, with significant negative effects on the community
2425	Disagree		
2426	Disagree		
2427	Neutral		
2428	Neutral		
2429	Disagree		I don't agree with the feeder school rationale so I don't agree with staff in feeder schools being given priority for their own children. I find the feeder school proposal very disturbing and a form of social selection based on postcode and 'Luck of the draw'. I think the consequences could be potentially massive, causing other trusts to be forced to do the same. It will inevitably skew the local community's choices when it comes to primary school selection (people will be anticipating that they need to have their child attend a feeder primary to allow for their choice of secondary to be honoured). It will impact the local property market etc (see below). My 4 and 7 year old girls go to Unicorn primary school. It is a fantastic local primary. Why on Earth should they not be able to attend the local secondary school ((next door!) and walk 10_x000D_Mins to school when they are 11 years old, safe and in their local_x000D_Community. Why should we be forced to put them in Eden Park high or move house ?? We moved into the area to secure their primary and secondary education.
2430	Disagree		
2431	Agree		
2432	Neutral		
2433	Disagree		
2434	Agree		
2435	Agree		Agree that children of staff are entitled to a place at the primary school employing their parent for the reason outlined below but not to extend this to a place available at the secondary school.

2436	Neutral		
2437	Neutral		
2438	Disagree		
2439	Disagree		This could significantly reduce the amount of places for children of the local area
2440	Disagree		
2441	Neutral		
2442	Disagree		
2443	Neutral		
2444	Disagree		
2445	Disagree		
2446	Disagree		I don't see their should be any connection between the primary schools and secondary schools in terms of priority admission, including staff children. Encouraging quality staff to feeder schools may impact on other schools in the area who are not feeder schools, with a negative impact across the area
2447	Disagree		
2448	Disagree		With children of teachers from five schools gaining automatic access, this will significantly decrease the availability of places available to the rest of the community and shrink the ‘catchment’ areas, with significant negative effects on the community
2449	Disagree		
2450	Disagree		
2451	Disagree		I don’t support this because it appears to apply to all staff. If it was part of the schools’ policy to recruit to hard to fill roles then I would be supportive but this feels too indiscriminate to have a net benefit for the local area.
2452	Disagree		
2453	Disagree		If staff children from all trust schools gain priority, they are likely to attend LPBS/LPGS and the following negative impacts are likely to occur: _x000D_ -Number of places left will reduce for the local community. _x000D_ -The LPGS/LPBS catchment area may reduce. Local children left outside a smaller catchment area have significantly increased uncertainty of the school they will attend and may have to travel further distance via car to a non local school. _x000D_ -Increased road traffic, vehicle emissions, reduced use of public transport and congestion where staff live outside the current average catchment area. _x000D_ -Attraction of ‘talented’ school staff and ability for schools within the trust to ‘cherry pick’ good performers, potentially reducing the quality of staff at schools outside the trust _x000D_ Parents who work in all other industries and non trustee schools have to make arrangement for their children to attend schools that may not be close to their place of work, therefore, it is only fair these parents have access to schools local to their home address for their children. _x000D_ The benefit of this proposal to the children that attend LPBS/LPGS and the local community is unclear
2454	Agree		
2455	Disagree		It is very likely to reduce the number of places available to children of non-teachers who live locally to the school.
2456	Agree		Good way to attract staff - should have a minimum threshold of time served at the school.
2457	Disagree		
2458	Agree		
2459	Agree		
2460	Agree		
2461	Not Applicable		
2462	Disagree		
2463	Disagree		
2464	Disagree		
2465	Disagree		In any staff proposal consideration should be given to how long they have been employed, minimum number of hours, and directly employed.
2466	Neutral		
2467	Disagree		To use this as an incentive to recruit staff is unfair.
2468	Disagree		If the children of the teachers from the named 5 schools get automatic places for their children will this not limit and decrease places for children who live within and in the surrounding community.
2469	Disagree		
2470	Neutral		
2471	Neutral		

2472	Disagree		This item is not mentioned in either option A or B, only children of staff in either LPSB or LPSG is mentioned, which is not a change and therefore I disagree. I see this option as misleading and should be struck out, as people will be confused by this. Is this deliberate?
2473	Disagree		The existing catchment area process based upon proximity and location serves to ensure fair opportunity for local pupils to attend either of the Langley Secondary Schools and the standard of education it provides. Through this ,long standing relationships and robust process are in place between local Primary schools , such as Pickhurst Junior Academy, which enables a smooth transition for local pupils as they enter local secondary education. This proposal puts this at risk, with many pupils from the Pickhurst most likely to be unable to obtain a place at the Langley Secondary Schools, as a result of Pupils of Staff (Primary schools) contributing to the oversubscription of places, regardless of where they reside.
2474	Neutral		
2475	Neutral		
2476	Neutral		
2477	Neutral		
2478	Disagree		
2479	Disagree		I can see no justification for this, it is unfair and distance from school should be the main criteria (apart from looked after children and siblings)
2480	Neutral		
2481	Disagree		If children of primary school staff were given priority as well as the children of secondary school staff, there would be five schools where children of staff had priority. This could significantly reduce the number of places available to children living locally and contribute to the 'catchment areas' shrinking further.
2482	Agree		
2483	Neutral		
2484	Disagree		
2485	Disagree		
2486	Disagree		Looked after children, then local children, then the children of staff from the Secondary Schools ONLY (if this makes the lives of the families easier). I disagree strongly that the children of staff from the Trusts Primary Schools should be able to attend the Secondaries if they are not from within the current local catchment area.
2487	Neutral		
2488	Agree		
2489	Disagree		
2490	Disagree		
2491	Agree		
2492	Disagree		totally not fair, will use up places meant for local children and will shrink the catchment area
2493	Disagree		This seems to be an irrelevant criteria for prioritisation given staff retention at the primary schools does not benefit the secondary schools. I do not believe this is usual practice in the area due to there not being a prevalence of feeder schools.
2494	Disagree		
2495	Disagree		
2496	Disagree		
2497	Disagree		
2498	Disagree		This will significantly decrease the availability of places available to the rest of the community and shrink the catchment areas, with significant negative effects on the community.
2499	Disagree		
2500	Neutral		
2501	Neutral		
2502	Disagree		This should only include Langley primary school
2503	Agree		
2504	Disagree		
2505	Neutral		
2506	Disagree		I believe that this would have a significant impact on the number of school places available to local children
2507	Neutral		
2508	Disagree		This would significantly reduce the availability of places for the rest of the community and result in 'shrinking' the catchment areas, with negative effects on the community.
2509	Disagree		This will significantly reduce the number of school spaces open to local children
2510	Disagree		If the primary schools are not granted feeder status then children of staff at the primary schools should not be given priority.
2511	Disagree		Do not agree with the feeder school staff having priority to admissions
2512	Disagree		With children of teachers from five schools gaining automatic access, this will significantly decrease the availability of places available to the rest of the community and significantly shrink the 'catchment' areas, with significant negative effects on the community.

2513	Neutral		
2514	Neutral		
2515	Neutral		
2516	Agree		In the context of the national recruitment and retention crisis with 30% of NQTs leaving teaching in their first year of teaching I would advocate giving priority to the children of staff for the great benefit of the wider school.
2517	Disagree		
2518	Disagree		
2519	Neutral		
2520	Disagree		
2521	Agree		School pick time and after school child care is a significant commitment for every parent including teachers. Having children of teachers given priority would support work life balance for staff and reduce the administration of arranging child care after school and pick arrangements.
2522	Disagree		
2523	Disagree		I think this is unfair as staff from the proposed (primary) feeder school may not live local to the school and would be taking up places i feel should go to children from the local area. Under these proposed changes alot of children will be deprived of a place at the school nearest to them because there will be less spaces available.
2524	Disagree		
2525	Disagree		I agree that it is fair to allow preference to children of staff to the specific school that they work at, but disagree that this should apply even if the children do not live with those staff. The rationale for children of staff to be given priority should be focussed on logistical reasons i.e. getting children to and from school and not simply for recruitment and retention reasons, which would be the case if the children are not living with the member of staff.
2526	Neutral		
2527	Disagree		Local children have already been discriminated against due to over subscription at the proposed feeder schools preventing them from attending their nearest primary schools. For this discrimination to continue as they apply for secondary schools is doubly discriminatory.
2528	Disagree		
2529	Disagree		
2530	Disagree		
2531	Neutral		
2532	Disagree		I agree that it is fair to allow preference to children of staff to the specific school that they work at, but disagree that this should apply even if the children do not live with those staff. The rationale for children of staff to be given priority should be focussed on logistical reasons i.e. getting children to and from school and not simply for recruitment and retention reasons, which would be the case if the children are not living with the member of staff.
2533	Neutral		
2534	Neutral		
2535	Disagree		I think children should go to the nearest school that best serves their needs and teachers often work away from their local area. Using admission as an employment benefit could unduly influence staff to take a job/remain in a job which is no longer suitable.
2536	Disagree		
2537	Neutral		
2538	Disagree		

2539	Disagree		<p>The stated reason for giving priority to the children of staff is, in short, staff recruitment and staff retention. _x000D_ However, there is no evidence, certainly in the consultation documentation that you have published, that _x000D_ there is: _x000D_</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (i) any material problem in attracting staff to and retaining them at these schools. These are highly _x000D_ desirable primary schools in nice areas and therefore naturally attract teachers. _x000D_ - (ii) that the proposed change to the criteria would in reality benefit the schools. _x000D_ <p>Indeed, the objective evidence shows that these changes to the oversubscription criteria are not necessary: _x000D_</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CHPS: this school is rated as outstanding by Ofsted including the quality of teaching, learning and _x000D_ assessment. https://files.ofsted.gov.uk/v1/file/50069130_x000D_ - HDPS: the most recent Ofsted Inspection reports as follows: &ldquo;Staff morale is high. Skilled teachers are _x000D_ supported by experienced subject leaders. You rightly prioritise the teaching of literacy and numeracy, _x000D_ but not at the expense of other subjects. The school&rsquo;s wide-ranging curriculum includes themed work _x000D_ which helps broaden pupils&rsquo; learning. The Eco Committee has been engaged in an Eco Schools scheme _x000D_ and has recently received an award for its work.&rdquo; https://files.ofsted.gov.uk/v1/file/2760163_x000D_ - LPPS: the most recent Ofsted Inspection also reports: &ldquo;Staff morale is very high. The school is small _x000D_ and has limited leadership roles. Leaders and staff take on additional responsibilities without _x000D_ hesitation. All teachers have responsibility for a subject area, for example, and have gained useful _x000D_ experience from this. They are aspiring leaders and committed to developing the school further as it _x000D_ grows.&rdquo; https://files.ofsted.gov.uk/v1/file/50081853_x000D_ <p>The objective evidence shows that teaching and leadership are Outstanding or good (and on an upward _x000D_ trajectory) and that staff morale is high or even very high. _x000D_ The changes to the oversubscription criteria are therefore not justified or proportionate in light of the reason _x000D_ given for them. Particularly as, of course, these changes would limit the places available to the children of _x000D_ people (including other teachers) who do not teach at these school.</p>
2540	Disagree		<p>With children of teachers from five schools gaining automatic access, this will significantly decrease the availability of places available to the rest of the community and shrink the &lsquo;catchment&rsquo; areas, with significant negative effects on the community. Other than an &lsquo;employment benefit for these teachers&rsquo; there is no reason to give their children priority over local children. Those children should be attending their own local school so that they can walk to school with their friends as we would like to hope our children will be able to.</p>
2541	Agree		
2542	Disagree		<p>With children of teachers from five schools will significantly decrease the availability of places available to the rest of the community and shrink the &lsquo;catchment&rsquo; areas, with significant negative effects on the community.</p>
2543	Disagree		
2544	Disagree		
2545	Disagree		<p>The teachers have no links to the secondary school</p>
2546	Neutral		
2547	Disagree		
2548	Disagree		<p>There is no reason to prioritise primary school age children of staff over local children to attended a school other than the ACTUAL school the staff is employed. This aids child care arrangements for staff. _x000D_ To prioritise children of staff to ANY primary school within the LPLT trust is truly discriminating against local primary children who should attend their local school. Local school for local children promotes many benefits, such as; reducing pollution, reducing traffic, reducing travel time and reducing the risk of instances occurring. _x000D_ I do not believe incentivising staff by offering a place at a LPLT school helps to recruit and retain high calibre teaching staff. In fact it can encourage staff turnover.</p>
2549	Disagree		<p>I do not believe that the reason supporting the proposal is valid. What evidence is there to suggest that this proposal would aid the recruitment of better staff? Or the retention of staff. Once a child is on the role the member of staff would have no reason to remain. _x000D_ The effect of this would however be detrimental to the local community, by reducing the number of places available to local children.</p>
2550	Neutral		
2551	Neutral		
2552	Disagree		
2553	Neutral		
2554	Disagree		

2555	Disagree		I feel this unfairly discriminates against children not in these schools. It is not a fair way to treat the children in the area who go to other primary schools and there is no reason for it. This is not the private school sector. I completely disagree with this proposal.
2556	Agree		
2557	Agree		
2558	No Response		
2559	Disagree		It eliminates the opportunity for the children around that area to have the choice to go to secondary schools. Thank
2560	Neutral		
2561	Disagree		
2562	Neutral		I am in broadly in favour of the proposal, but there is no indication of the number of staff that would be eligible. 3 primary and 1 senior school staffing having priority will not be insignificant number._x000D_ Children of staff from any of the primary schools should have priority at any of the primary schools.
2563	Neutral		
2564	Disagree		
2565	Disagree		It is outrageous to even think about giving priority to the children of teachers. Whilst I appreciate that it is a method of retaining and rewarding staff it is nothing but nepotism. Many children may not even be from the local area and will in fact be robbing local children of the ability to attend their local school and will often mean they need to travel across the borough to attend school.
2566	Neutral		
2567	Disagree		
2568	Neutral		
2569	Agree		
2570	Agree		
2571	Agree		
2572	Not Applicable		
2573	Not Applicable		
2574	Not Applicable		
2575	Neutral		
2576	Disagree		I don't agree with the concept of feeder schools as it discriminatory to my daughters as they would no longer have choice, through no fault of their own.
2577	Disagree		
2578	Not Applicable		
2579	Disagree		
2580	Agree		
2581	Agree		
2582	Agree		
2583	Agree		
2584	Not Applicable		
2585	Disagree		
2586	Not Applicable		
2587	Disagree		
2588	Agree		
2589	Neutral		
2590	Agree		This should only apply however to the children actually living with the member of staff during the weekdays in school term time. If the child resides elsewhere there is no reason to offer an automatic place since they will not be travelling in to school with the parent teaching at any of the academy's schools.
2591	Agree		
2592	Disagree		Having feeder primary schools means children within walking distance could miss out on a place at their local secondary school in favour of children who drive or bus. It's ridiculous to be within walking distance of a good state school and not get in. Also means the primary schools who feed don't need to push for outstanding standards as people will send their children there whatever happens on the promise of good secondary education.
2593	Agree		
2594	Neutral		
2595	Agree		
2596	Disagree		

2597	Agree		
2598	Agree		
2599	Neutral		
2600	Disagree		This is a huge change to policy and an unfair advantage to schools that have no connection to Langley and shouldn't have the right to be a feeder school. I'm outraged as a parent who moved to the area for my son to have access to a successful school Langley Boys and is not part of feeder school.
2601	Disagree		
2602	Neutral		
2603	Neutral		
2604	Neutral		
2605	Agree		
2606	Disagree		
2607	Neutral		
2608	Disagree		Parents gain employment to get their children into a school and then leave, siblings are then entitled to attend as well restricts the catchment are
2609	Neutral		
2610	Neutral		
2611	Disagree		These are separate schools albeit they may be in the same Academy Trust. Admission arrangements should relate to the school in question.
2612	Agree		
2613	Neutral		
2614	Neutral		
2615	Agree		
2616	Neutral		
2617	Agree		I do not have an issue with children of staff at a primary school having priority for their own children at that primary school, however this priority should not be transferred to the child when they attend secondary school unless that parent becomes a teacher of that secondary school.
2618	Agree		
2619	Disagree		
2620	Disagree		
2621	Agree		
2622	Neutral		
2623	Neutral		
2624	Disagree		I think the two options outlined are biased to the residents of the local area who possibly did not get their children into lpps or one of the other local schools in the trust due to over subscription. This means that any new residents to the local area will not be able to get their children into lpps or lpgs and is discriminatory. Also it will encourage people to move away from the area as soon as their child enters lpps and then their admission to secondary school will not be affected. This should also be taken into consideration.
2625	Neutral		
2626	Neutral		
2627	Disagree		
2628	Neutral		
2629	Agree		This would be in line with the current secondary school policy.
2630	Neutral		
2631	Disagree		
2632	Neutral		
2633	Not Applicable		
2634	Disagree		
2635	Agree		
2636	Disagree		
2637	Disagree		
2638	Neutral		
2639	Disagree		
2640	Agree		
2641	Disagree		
2642	Agree		

2643	Disagree		
2644	Neutral		
2645	Disagree		It doesn't seem fair to allow school staff children who could potentially live far from the school an advantage over children who live locally.
2646	Disagree		
2647	Neutral		
2648	Disagree		
2649	Disagree		
2650	Agree		
2651	Not Applicable		
2652	Neutral		
2653	Disagree		
2654	Disagree		
2655	Disagree		
2656	Disagree		
2657	Agree		
2658	Agree		
2659	Agree		
2660	Agree		
2661	Disagree		
2662	Agree		
2663	Agree		
2664	Disagree		
2665	Disagree		Not a fair allocation method. This would not serve the local community, as does not provide one set of rules for all. It would not be a level playing field.
2666	Agree		
2667	Disagree		
2668	Disagree		
2669	Disagree		
2670	Neutral		
2671	Agree		To attract good quality teachers
2672	Agree		Attract best quality teachers
2673	Disagree		
2674	Disagree		
2675	Disagree		
2676	Neutral		
2677	Agree		Think it makes sense for children of teachers to attend the school, also ensures great teachers want to be at the school especially if they have children
2678	Agree		
2679	Disagree		
2680	Disagree		
2681	Agree		
2682	No Response		
2683	Agree		I agree if this means that the Langley Trust can retain their teachers.
2684	Neutral		
2685	Agree		
2686	Neutral		
2687	Disagree		
2688	Neutral		
2689	Disagree		
2690	Neutral		
2691	Disagree		It is as if I was a nurse and gave my child priority in medical treatment! We all work in different locations from the school of our children.
2692	Disagree		

2693	Neutral		
2694	Disagree		
2695	Agree		
2696	Disagree		
2697	Disagree		The principle of creating a feeder school through this trust is detrimental to other schools/families and the community as a whole. It fragments the whole school system.
2698	Disagree		
2699	Neutral		
2700	Disagree		
2701	Agree		
2702	Neutral		
2703	Disagree		
2704	Disagree		
2705	Disagree		Should make no difference, every parent has to juggle child care and if they choose to work in a different area to where there children go that's there choice.unfair on local children
2706	Disagree		I feel this should only be an advantage for LPPS staff as they are taking their children to a school in a campus where they work.
2707	Disagree		
2708	Disagree		
2709	Agree		
2710	Disagree		
2711	Agree		
2712	Disagree		
2713	Agree		
2714	Disagree		
2715	Disagree		
2716	Disagree		
2717	Agree		
2718	Disagree		
2719	Agree		
2720	Agree		
2721	Disagree		
2722	Disagree		
2723	Neutral		
2724	Disagree		
2725	Agree		
2726	Disagree		
2727	Disagree		
2728	Disagree		All children should have the same chance at attending a school within their catchment area.
2729	Neutral		
2730	Neutral		
2731	Agree		
2732	Disagree		I believe the creation of feeder school system from primary schools to secondary is unfair and takes away choice from parents and families. I think it is is 100% fair that a parent who is a number of staff at that school should have a right for their child to attend the school where they work but don't see why it should apply to all schools in the network.
2733	Agree		
2734	Not Applicable		
2735	Agree		
2736	Agree		
2737	Disagree		
2738	Disagree		
2739	Agree		This makes sense for the quality staff retention reasons given. High quality staff may decide to move to other schools where this policy is offered and where they feel more secure than their children will be offered a place.
2740	Disagree		

2741	Disagree		
2742	Disagree		
2743	Disagree		
2744	Disagree		As long as you live in the close proximity of the school those students should take priority so children can easily get to and from school safely which has shears been the number one priority!!!
2745	Neutral		
2746	Agree		
2747	Agree		
2748	Disagree		
2749	Disagree		
2750	Not Applicable		
2751	Disagree		
2752	Disagree		
2753	Neutral		
2754	Agree		
2755	Disagree		
2756	Disagree		
2757	Disagree		
2758	Disagree		There is no obvious reason to disadvantage others purely because they follow other career paths.
2759	Disagree		
2760	Neutral		
2761	Disagree		This will disadvantage local children
2762	Agree		
2763	Agree		
2764	Disagree		
2765	Disagree		
2766	Disagree		
2767	Agree		
2768	No Response		
2769	Disagree		I don't see why children of primary school staff should be given priority to a school their parents don't work at. There are no logistical benefits.
2770	Agree		
2771	Disagree		Area is already oversubscribed to give advantage that isn't based on catchment area
2772	Disagree		
2773	Agree		Keeps teachers committed to schools and there needs to be a perk given how little teachers and support staff are paid
2774	Disagree		
2775	No Response		
2776	Disagree		
2777	Disagree		
2778	Agree		
2779	Disagree		
2780	Agree		This also assists teachers with young children with work:life balance and wrap around care
2781	Neutral		
2782	Agree		
2783	Agree		
2784	Neutral		
2785	Disagree		
2786	Agree		
2787	Agree		
2788	Not Applicable		
2789	Neutral		
2790	Disagree		

2791	Disagree		Why should the children be given priority for secondary schools, they can travel by themselves unlike primary school.
2792	Neutral		
2793	Disagree		
2794	Agree		Very difficult to drop your children at school otherwise. Teachers are already under extreme pressure, we should do anything we can do to help them . The numbers will not make a material difference.
2795	Agree		
2796	Neutral		
2797	Agree		
2798	Disagree		
2799	Neutral		
2800	Neutral		
2801	Neutral		
2802	Disagree		Feeder schools make the process unfair selection, effectively children in the feeder schools have 2 options to be selected. It seems unfair to children in other local schools in the area
2803	Neutral		
2804	Disagree		
2805	Neutral		
2806	Disagree		Admission criteria in the past have been on proximity to the school. Staff can come and go, they may be granted a place and then leave the school. Priority should not be made to staff.
2807	Agree		I have no objection to this proposal. It is consistent with the arrangements at a number of other local primaries
2808	Disagree		
2809	Agree		To help retain good teaching staff within the schools
2810	Disagree		My reasons are: the environment and a sense of community: Please consider giving priority to students next to the school who can walk to the school, making them reach their home/ school quicker and protecting them from any dangers they may be facing (road accident, bad encountering etc...) and the stress they may be enduring (delayed bus etc...) when commuting. you divide community when inviting teachers, no matter how far they live, to come and commute (most probably by car) creating more traffic on the road and therefore more pollution. My children living locally would like to meet up with their friends who also live locally, so they can meet often, develop friendship and have a real sense of community; making friends with people living further away and who they have to travel far to meet outside school is not ideal. Your changes will mean that some children living locally may have to go further to get the education they deserve to have by their home. From experience, in LPSG, there is a large turnover of teachers so this, in my mind, invalidate your point. You say as a trust, the schools within, do share same ethos and values; what are they? what values from any other school do you not share? I assume that as teachers from any public schools, you all believe in equal education for all. You are making the tasks of choosing school more stressful, we have enough between grammar schools, private school, independent schools etc....; the state schools should stop bringing more divisions. It brings divisions amongst our young children which should have the right to be proud of their school, no matter which trust, or academy it belongs to. Our kids feel under pressure to choose well, why would we want primary kids to feel any pressure at all? Surely school already exchange experiences and support each other whenever possible, your trust must have another motivation.
2811	Neutral		There is no indication of possible numbers per year, so the impact of the proposal on admissions is unknown.
2812	Disagree		I do not think that staff of Primary Schools should have priority of admission places.
2813	Disagree		
2814	Neutral		
2815	Agree		
2816	Disagree		This is an unnecessary arrangement in an already oversubscribed area. This offers no benefit to adult or child and instead a serious cause for concern should the member of staff live outside of the area. The child travelling to and from the school would increase burden on public transport or worse if travelling by car. In addition it is unacceptable that a local child should miss out on a place at a local school because that place is being offered as a 'perk' of the job.
2817	Disagree		A local child should not miss out on a place at a local school due to a teacher (who may live at the area) being offered this as part of a recruitment package. There are plenty of other options which can tempt and retain people into teaching. This is an out of date solution to a very modern problem, schools are becoming more and more oversubscribed so this cannot continue. No information is provided detailing how long the teacher has to have been working with the trust to enjoy this benefit and how long they would have to stay. What is being proposed here is potentially a child could gain a place in a feeder school and then be entitled to education within the trust until they are 18 years of age, irrespective of where they live and if their parent is still working for the trust.
2818	Neutral		
2819	Agree		Easier for the Teacher and family life, also the Teacher has 100% in that school, not just from a job basis

2820	Disagree		Any priority given to children of staff will result eventually in 50% plus of all places being given to non local children. This is exacerbated by the sibling rule where a teacher or other member of staff taking up a post and getting a priority place for a first child in year 1 of primary school could block school places for 20 years with multiple siblings. The staff member could leave the school once their first child is in after completing 1 school term! Teachers especially are in a transitory jobs market and schools are subject to massive amounts of churn. Whilst most teachers would not use this method to secure a placement to introduce their first child and then leave the school this proposal is wide open to that sort of abuse. How many teachers / staff would take up the post on the basis that their children would be obliged to leave with them? There are many good teachers living within the schools catchment area who would secure places for their children without a skewed rule. Children of local people in every profession should be given a level playing field and have the opportunity of attending their local school. The existing policy based on proximity should be retained
2821	Disagree		
2822	Disagree		
2823	Disagree		
2824	Neutral		
2825	Neutral		
2826	Neutral		
2827	Disagree		
2828	Disagree		With children of teachers from five schools gaining automatic access, this will significantly decrease the availability of places available to the rest of the community and shrink the 'catchment' areas, with significant negative effects on the community.
2829	Disagree		With children of teachers from five schools gaining automatic access, this will significantly decrease the availability of places available to the rest of the community and shrink the 'catchment' areas, with significant negative effects on the community.
2830	Neutral		
2831	Neutral		
2832	Disagree		The current Oversubscription Criteria is the sensible and desired option.
2833	Agree		
2834	Not Applicable		
2835	Disagree		
2836	Neutral		
2837	Neutral		
2838	Neutral		
2839	Disagree		
2840	Disagree		
2841	Neutral		
2842	Disagree		
2843	Agree		
2844	Disagree		
2845	Disagree		
2846	Disagree		
2847	Agree		
2848	Neutral		
2849	Agree		Given the age of children involved it makes sense they can travel with the teacher and dropped off in the same location
2850	Disagree		
2851	Agree		
2852	Neutral		
2853	Agree		
2854	Agree		
2855	Neutral		
2856	Neutral		
2857	Agree		
2858	Agree		
2859	Agree		
2860	Disagree		
2861	Agree		

2862	Disagree		
2863	Neutral		
2864	Disagree		
2865	Disagree		
2866	Disagree		
2867	Agree		
2868	Agree		
2869	Agree		
2870	Neutral		
2871	Neutral		
2872	Neutral		
2873	Disagree		
2874	Not Applicable		
2875	Disagree		I think everyone should be given a fair and equal chance
2876	Disagree		Unfair to give staffs children priority just because they work there, it should relate to catchment area.
2877	Disagree		Totally unfair. I understand that it would be easier in terms of childcare but this should not be prioritised over distance from the school. The rest of us working mothers have to organise appropriate childcare outside of school hours. It would be completely unfair for a child living close to a school to miss out on a place due to a child living miles away gaining a place as they have a parent working at the school. What about when the parent leaves the school for another job a year later?!
2878	Neutral		
2879	Agree		
2880	Neutral		
2881	Agree		
2882	Neutral		
2883	Disagree		
2884	Disagree		
2885	Neutral		
2886	Neutral		
2887	Disagree		
2888	No Response		
2889	Agree		
2890	Agree		To help working parents
2891	Disagree		This is a proposal is simply to improve the attractiveness of employment to the academy network above the needs of local children; there is a shortage of quality secondary schools in the area, anything that further impacts the number of spaces for local people ahead of, for example, staff that typically live outside of catchment in the schools they work for, should not even reach the consultation stage.
2892	Agree		
2893	Agree		
2894	Disagree		
2895	Agree		
2896	Disagree		
2897	Neutral		
2898	Neutral		
2899	Agree		Would help with recruitment of good teachers as in the middle of a recruitment crisis
2900	Agree		It would support the recruitment and retention of high quality staff. In turn stability and good outcomes for our children.
2901	Neutral		
2902	No Response		
2903	Neutral		
2904	Not Applicable		
2905	Agree		
2906	Neutral		

2907	Agree		I know how hard it can be and how many problems it can cause having your child in a different school to the one you work in, particularly when you don't work near your home address, meaning without this criteria in place, your child would be unlikely to get a place at that school. It makes life much easier if your child attends the school you work in.
2908	No Response		
2909	Agree		
2910	Agree		
2911	Disagree		
2912	Agree		
2913	Not Applicable		
2914	Agree		As it will help recruit good staff and therefore have wider benefits
2915	Disagree		Doesn't seem right. All parents work very hard and should be given equal opportunity to send their children to primary schools.
2916	Agree		
2917	Agree		
2918	Disagree		
2919	Agree		
2920	Agree		
2921	Agree		
2922	Agree		
2923	Neutral		
2924	Agree		
2925	Agree		
2926	Neutral		
2927	Agree		
2928	Agree		
2929	Agree		
2930	Agree		
2931	Agree		
2932	Neutral		
2933	Neutral		
2934	Disagree		
2935	Agree		
2936	Agree		
2937	Disagree		
2938	Agree		Gives a better choice when it comes to employing staff, as it means that staff with school aged children would not be put off joining the school because they are unable to be in 2 places at once.
2939	Disagree		
2940	Agree		
2941	Neutral		
2942	Disagree		
2943	Agree		
2944	Agree		
2945	Disagree		I think they should have the same chance as other parents.
2946	Disagree		
2947	Neutral		
2948	Disagree		
2949	Agree		
2950	Agree		
2951	Disagree		
2952	Disagree		Teachers might not live within the area local to the senior school thus depriving a child who lives within the 1 mile radius the chance to go!
2953	Agree		It encourages staff retention and will assist in recruiting the best staff
2954	Disagree		

2955	Disagree		
2956	Agree		I think this is ok as it makes family life easier and makes staff more invested in the schools.
2957	Agree		
2958	Agree		
2959	Disagree		We moved to get into the catchment now the places are going to go to the feeder school, totally unfair!
2960	Disagree		
2961	Agree		
2962	Neutral		
2963	Neutral		
2964	Neutral		
2965	Disagree		There shouldn't be any priority to them, we have to balance child care with our place of work. The same should apply for teachers. Their children should go to schools in their postcode to their house.
2966	Agree		It makes it easier to recruit good staff.
2967	Disagree		
2968	Agree		
2969	Disagree		
2970	Disagree		
2971	Neutral		
2972	Disagree		
2973	Agree		
2974	Disagree		As a local resident I believe it is best to have an admissions policy that minimises traffic and pollution. Giving priority to the children of teachers at quite remote schools will do little to reduce the traffic, pollution and danger in the area at school drop off and pick up.
2975	Disagree		
2976	Neutral		
2977	Disagree		
2978	Agree		
2979	Disagree		It should always be based on where you live.
2980	Disagree		
2981	Disagree		
2982	Disagree		
2983	Disagree		
2984	Disagree		
2985	Disagree		Does this mean the children of staff at primary schools getting places at secondary schools? If so This could easily bring in children from miles away where the teachers live limiting further the places for local children.
2986	Not Applicable		
2987	Disagree		
2988	Disagree		
2989	Disagree		Not in the interests of the schools to give priority to staff - likely to end up in a faster turnaround of staff where staff take jobs just to get their child into a particular school and then leave for a more convenient job. Teachers may live far out of the natural catchment for the school, thus disadvantaging local children being able to access their local school.
2990	Neutral		
2991	Agree		
2992	Disagree		
2993	Disagree		
2994	Disagree		The children of staff at primary schools within the MAT may not live within the catchment area. Staff travel for work and this may mean children from Biggin Hill or Bromley Common for example may take precedence over a child who lives within walking distance and has attended Pickhurst Junior Academy.
2995	Disagree		
2996	Disagree		Teachers at CHPS, HDPS or LPPS may not live in the area. As they don't work at LPSB or LPSG, there seems no logical reason to provide them with a space. Doing so may take a place from a child who lives within walking distance. This, in turn, may lead to additional commuting (and corresponding pollution) for both the disadvantaged child who lives within walking distance, and the child that is of the teacher at CHPS, HDPS or LPPS. Children of staff of LPSB/G will not have a detrimental environmental impact by travelling in with their parents.
2997	Neutral		

2998	Agree		
2999	Agree		
3000	Agree		
3001	Neutral		
3002	Disagree		
3003	Agree		
3004	Neutral		
3005	Not Applicable		
3006	Disagree		
3007	Agree		
3008	Agree		
3009	Disagree		
3010	Neutral		
3011	Agree		
3012	Agree		
3013	Neutral		Would not bother me or my family if children of teachers get in to the schools as long as Langley Park Primary School became a feeder school for the secondary schools.
3014	Agree		
3015	Disagree		Don't think this is fair. I've moved locally so that my son can attend Langley. Think it should stick to the current policy and its not fair staff gets first choice.
3016	Disagree		
3017	Agree		
3018	Agree		
3019	Disagree		
3020	Disagree		Staff may not live anywhere near the location of the school in question. Their children should not be prioritised over local residents. Every working parent has to make arrangements for their child's schooling irrespective of where the parent works, so the 'convenience' of taking your child to school with you each day is irrelevant.
3021	Disagree		I disagree with this proposal because: a) By allowing children of staff to have priority places at the primary schools, you are allowing places in the schools to go to children who may well live outside of the schools' catchments. Furthermore, if the proposed feeder arrangements are put in place, staff children gaining places at the primary schools would be amongst the children getting priority access to the Langley secondaries, thereby compounding one of the main issues of introducing the feeder arrangements - that places in the Langley secondaries will be going to children that are not local to the school; b) "Staff" is not defined and not sufficiently precise. "Staff", if defined simply as "teachers" only, would cover a large number of people, all of who could get priority spaces for their kids at the primary schools. If "staff" encompasses anyone who works at the schools (eg. Admin staff), that number could be significantly higher.
3022	Disagree		I'm a concerned local resident and citizen in the borough whose children both went to LPSB and I lament this divisive measure which will erode public services and shared responsibilities o the community for educational provision.

3023	Disagree		<p>Whilst I understand and acknowledge the desire to recruit exceptional talent and encourage staff retention, I strongly object to the proposal to give priority to the children of staff at the primary schools for admissions to those primary schools.</p> <p>The proposed changes to the admissions criteria for the primary schools cannot and should not be considered in isolation to the proposed changes to the admissions criteria for the secondary schools as changes to the admissions criteria for any school within a Multi-Academy Trust (MAT) can have potential implications for the other schools within that MAT.</p> <p>Under the current proposals (Option A and Option B) for Langley Park School for Boys and Langley Park School for Girls, the addition of named feeder schools would create a direct dependency on the admissions criteria for the relevant Trust primary schools, which would in effect become admissions criteria for the secondary schools too.</p> <p>In particular, giving priority to the children of staff employed at the primary schools in the admissions arrangements for those primary schools would, by default, also guarantee those children places at Langley Park School for Boys or Langley Park School for Girls when those children reach Year 6. By Year 6, their parent, who was a member of staff when the child joined the Trust primary school in Reception, may have since left the primary school's employment, potentially, and allowably, some years before.</p> <p>To guarantee a child's education through to 18, on the basis of the parent's occupation when the child is 4 (and also for any subsequent siblings) is not only a significant and valuable "perk" when the secondary school is as highly sought after and already oversubscribed as LPSB and LPSG are, but is potentially in contravention of Section 1.9(f) of the School Admissions Code which states that Admission Authorities "must not: give priority to children based on the occupational status ... of parents applying."</p> <p>Naming the Trust's primary schools as feeder schools for the secondary schools, at the same time as introducing priority for children of staff of the primary schools at the primary schools, would, in effect, be giving priority in the secondary school admissions to children based not only on the occupational status of the parent, but on the occupational status of the parent some 6 years (or more in the case of subsequent siblings utilising the sibling criteria) prior to the application to join the secondary school.</p> <p>Whilst I understand that schools are permitted to give priority in their admissions arrangements to children of staff under specific circumstances (School Admissions Code Section 1.39), I don't believe this change will necessarily engender a level of staff quality and retention that justifies guaranteeing an all through education from 4 to 18, particularly at already heavily oversubscribed secondary schools. Once the children of staff have obtained places at the primary schools there is no further incentive for them to remain employed there, and with the staff of up to three primary schools being able to secure places at the secondary schools for their children (and any subsequent siblings) from Reception, the full impact of this change may not be fully felt or appreciated for some 6-7 years or beyond.</p> <p>Consequently, I believe that this change to admissions criteria for the primary schools, if brought about in conjunction with the addition of named feeder schools for the secondary schools is wholly unreasonable, and with the lack of transparency regarding the potential implications of dependency between the secondary and primary admissions criteria, in contravention of Section 1.8 of the School Admissions Code which requires that "Oversubscription criteria must be reasonable, clear, objective [and] procedurally fair".</p>
3024	Not Applicable		
3025	Disagree		
3026	Disagree		<p>I disagree with this proposal because:</p> <p>a) By allowing children of staff to have priority places at the primary schools, you are allowing places in the schools to go to children who may well live outside of the schools' catchments. Furthermore, if the proposed feeder arrangements are put in place, staff children gaining places at the primary schools would be amongst the children getting priority access to the Langley secondaries, thereby compounding one of the main issues of introducing the feeder arrangements - that places in the Langley secondaries will be going to children that are not local to the school;</p> <p>b) "Staff" is not defined and not sufficiently precise. "Staff", if defined simply as "teachers" only, would cover a large number of people, all of who could get priority spaces for their kids at the primary schools. If "staff" encompasses anyone who works at the schools (eg. Admin staff), that number could be significantly higher.</p>
3027	Disagree		
3028	Disagree		
3029	Disagree		The current arrangements should continue.
3030	Agree		
3031	Neutral		
3032	Agree		
3033	Neutral		
3034	Disagree		
3035	Neutral		
3036	Disagree		
3037	Neutral		
3038	Disagree		Why should staff who work at Clare house primary school for example, have priority for their child over a child who lives in the catchment of lpsb/lpsg? This makes no sense.

3039	Neutral		
3040	Neutral		
3041	Neutral		
3042	Disagree		
3043	Neutral		
3044	Disagree		
3045	Agree		
3046	Neutral		
3047	Neutral		
3048	Neutral		<p>I think that in the case of Option A, where a member of staff in LPPS is sending their child to LPPS, then it would seem fair and practical for that child to have a preference over other children for entry into either secondary school.</p> <p>Teachers have a challenging time as it is with logistical arrangements and receive few benefits, so for teachers of LPPS, this seems fair.</p>
3049	Agree		
3050	Agree		
3051	Disagree		<p>The stated reason for giving priority to the children of staff is, in short, staff recruitment and staff retention. However, there is no evidence, certainly in the consultation documentation that you have published, that there is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (i) any material problem in attracting staff to and retaining them at these schools. These are highly desirable primary schools in nice areas and therefore naturally attract teachers. - (ii) that the proposed change to the criteria would in reality benefit the schools. <p>Indeed, the objective evidence shows that these changes to the oversubscription criteria are not necessary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CHPS: this school is rated as outstanding by Ofsted including the quality of teaching, learning and assessment. https://files.ofsted.gov.uk/v1/file/50069130 - HDPS: the most recent Ofsted Inspection reports as follows: "Staff morale is high. Skilled teachers are supported by experienced subject leaders. You rightly prioritise the teaching of literacy and numeracy, but not at the expense of other subjects. The school's wide-ranging curriculum includes themed work which helps broaden pupils' learning. The Eco Committee has been engaged in an Eco Schools scheme and has recently received an award for its work." https://files.ofsted.gov.uk/v1/file/2760163 - LPPS: the most recent Ofsted Inspection also reports: "Staff morale is very high. The school is small and has limited leadership roles. Leaders and staff take on additional responsibilities without hesitation. All teachers have responsibility for a subject area, for example, and have gained useful experience from this. They are aspiring leaders and committed to developing the school further as it grows." https://files.ofsted.gov.uk/v1/file/50081853 <p>The objective evidence shows that teaching and leadership are Outstanding or good (and on an upward trajectory) and that staff morale is high or even very high.</p> <p>The changes to the oversubscription criteria are therefore not justified or proportionate in light of the reason given for them. Particularly as, of course, these changes would limit the places available to the children of people (including other teachers) who do not teach at these school.</p>
3052	Disagree		<p>We do not believe it is equitable for children of staff from the entire academy to be given priority access to the secondary schools over and above children closer to the school. There is also no indication of impact on school numbers.</p>
3053	Disagree		<p>I think it is always preferable for children to be at their closest secondary school to allow them to walk/cycle themselves and develop their independence. These children are 11+ and do not need to be driven by their parents and it does not alter that fact if the parent is a teacher at any particular primary school.</p>
3054	Neutral		
3055	Neutral		
3056	Agree		<p>This proposal would benefit the Trust and all its schools. It would improve recruitment and retention of the highest quality staff, which can only benefit and improve the education of our children.</p>
3057	Agree		<p>Agree I think it is fair for children of staff working at primary schools to get priority as the parents will be travelling there anyway so it makes sense for them to be in the same place.</p>
3058	Agree		<p>Incentivising and encouraging quality staff to the Trust Schools should be a key priority. This should improve retention and further bolster the 'all through' ethos that the Trust is promoting with its option B proposal for all three primary schools to become feeders.</p>
3059	Neutral		
3060	Neutral		
3061	Neutral		

3062	Disagree		<p>This particular proposed change could be seen as a 'perk' to attract new staff, and retain existing employees, at LPLT schools.</p> <p>Would it apply to all staff? Teachers, TAs, support staff?</p> <p>What happens when a child when the parent staff member leaves and becomes employed at another school outside of the Trust?</p>
3063	Disagree		<p>If the member of staff does not reside at an address within the school's catchment area, or if the child resides with the non-teaching parent at an address outside the catchment area, the child gets an automatic place this has the following negative effects.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It reduces the number of available places for local children that live within the catchment areas of the Trusts primary schools. 2. If places for local children are reduced, local children will end up at schools further away. The consequences of this are... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Longer travelling times to school, increasing the length of the school day • Having to use public transport results in a negative impact on the environment eg. more pollution • If private transport is used, it will increase congestion within the local area. • It can have a detrimental effect to their health (less exercise as they are unable to walk or cycle to school due to the increased distance) and mental wellbeing.
3064	Neutral		
3065	Agree		<p>This proposed change seems logical. Our comments below relate to all 3 primary schools.</p> <p>It is a big step for children of primary school age (up to 11 years) to undertake a change in life by attending school after the safety and security of their home. In our opinion it would be comforting for pupils to know that there is an adult employed, and potentially visible, at their school to whom they could relate to in times of any distress.</p> <p>If the pupil could travel to and from school with that particular staff member, this would possibly minimise family social disruption as well as save on separate transport arrangements for the child and staff member.</p>
3066	Neutral		
3067	Neutral		
3068	Neutral		
3069	Disagree		
3070	Agree		
3071	Neutral		
3072	Neutral		
3073	Disagree		
3074	Disagree		
3075	Disagree		

